


LP

F

5012

1857

R9L



3 9004 01444368 0

DR. RYERSON'S LETTERS
IN REPLY TO THE ATTACKS OF
FOREIGN ECCLESIASTICS

AGAINST
The Schools and Municipalities of Upper Canada,
INCLUDING THE LETTERS OF
BISHOP CHARBONNEL, MR. BRUYÈRE,
AND
BISHOP PINSONEAULT.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
No. 1.—BISHOP CHARBONNEL.—The spirit of the Normal School ceremony not prevalent in the country	1
No. 2.—BISHOP CHARBONNEL.—Catholics of Chatham worse off than the Negroes	2
No. 3.—DR. RYERSON.—The new demands of the Bishop are ominous of evil	2
No. 4.—BISHOP CHARBONNEL.—This is a sectarian country, and dangerous to faith and morals	4
No. 5.—DR. RYERSON.—The new class of ideas imported by the Bishop from the Continent of Europe indicate a "foreign element," opposed to Canadian freedom	6
No. 6.—BISHOP CHARBONNEL.—Quotes Baltimore Councils demanding schools worthy of the American and Canadian liberalism so much vaunted in the world,—instead of a disguised persecution,—or the Bishops and the Pope will overthrow all	17
No. 7.—DR. RYERSON.—Baltimore Councils are Rules of the "foreign ecclesiastics" of one class of religionists. The Bishops and the Pope won't be supported in their crusade by Canadian Catholics	19
No. 8.—BISHOP CHARBONNEL.—Opinions differ; but he won't upset the Government of Canada	28
No. 9.—BISHOP CHARBONNEL.—Does not like Dr. Ryerson's controversy	28
No. 10.—DR. RYERSON.—Shews that it is all Bishop Charbonnel's fault	29
No. 11.—DR. RYERSON'S Circular to Municipalities on the Clergy Reserves	33
No. 12.—REV. J. M. BRUYÈRE.—Is opposed to "dictation," but gives his own advice about the Reserves. Says certain Books are not allowed in Libraries	35
No. 13.—DR. RYERSON.—Catholic Books were selected for the Libraries by Bishop Charbonnel. The "foreign element" distasteful to Catholics	42
No. 14.—REV. J. M. BRUYÈRE.—Charges about books "unintentional." Wants the Reserves for Catholic purposes. Does not like to be called a "foreign element." The majority of Canadian born Catholics are "half heathens"	53
No. 15.—DR. RYERSON.—"Foreign Element" introduced since the time of Bishops Power and McDonell. Accepts charge of the "half heathens;" they are his fellow countrymen	63
No. 16.—REV. J. M. BRUYÈRE.—Goes over his old charges; and shews how ill the "Extreme kindness" of the <i>Leader</i> has been rewarded	73
No. 17.—DR. RYERSON.—Is sorry the "foreign element" cannot bring out a better fighting man	88
No. 18.—REV. J. M. BRUYÈRE.—Deals tenderly with his former opinions on the relations of the State, the Church and the Parent. Bishops and Pope have changed their minds about the Irish National Schools	89
No. 19.—BISHOP PINSONEAULT.—Consoles with Mr. Bruyère on the "Foreign Element."	93
No. 20.—DR. RYERSON.—How Archbishop Murray, and Bishops Power and McDonell acted. Their policy in Ireland and Canada reversed by the "new foreign element." A patriotic Canadianism the foundation of Canadian greatness	97
No. 21.—Addendum in regard to Bishop Power	104

TORONTO:

LOVELL & GIBSON, CORNER OF YONGE AND MELINDA STREETS.

1857.

FOR SALE AT THE BOOKSTORES.

Price Sevenpence halfpenny.

TO THE READER.

The publication of these letters has been undertaken with the two-fold object of showing : 1st. That all the attacks upon our National School system have come from the foreign ecclesiastics lately imported from the continent of Europe ; and 2nd. That these claim a power in the State,—not the right of aliens,—not concurred in by the vast majority of Canadian Catholics (as they themselves admit)—but antagonistic to the spirit of that British constitutional freedom which we boast has become more perfectly developed in our Canadian institutions than in those of the fatherland.

A word may also be added in regard to the authors of the letters here given : None of them have been consulted, and none of them—so far as we know—are aware of their present publication,—certainly Dr. Ryerson is not. Perhaps in addition to arousing public attention to the manœuvres of the “new foreign element,” their publication may rebuke the puerile taunts of certain newspaper writers against one of the public officers of the Province, who shewed more regard for the dignity of his position, and for the credit of his country, than to notice the petty offers of a “joint-stock publication business” with a subordinate member of the “new foreign ecclesiastical element’.

CORRESPONDENCE.

1. Bishop Charbonnel to Dr. Ryerson.

+ IRISHTOWN, (near Chatham,)
20th February, 1852.

The spirit of the Normal School Ceremony not prevalent in certain localities.

REVEREND AND DEAR DR.—I beg to recommend to your equity, and to the good spirit of our Council of Public Instruction, the petition of the R. Catholics of Chatham.

My visitation through the Diocese convinces me more and more that this spirit, so solemnly professed at the laying of the corner stone of the Normal School by different interested parties, and particularly by our most excellent Governor General, is far from being prevalent in certain localities (a.)

For God's sake, and for the prosperity of the country, let us combine all our exertions, that religious liberty, liberty of conscience, may be more real than nominal; there is no other element of peace in this part of the world, composed of so many different persuasions.

As for me, I will do anything and make any sacrifice for the success of a principle, the privation of which is nothing short of a more or less disguised persecution.

I remain, with the best feelings of respect, your most devoted Servant,
(Signed) + ARM'DUS FR. MY.

Bp. of Toronto.

Rev. Dr. E. Ryerson,
Chief Superintendent of Education.

2. Bishop Charbonnel to Dr. Ryerson.

+ LONDON, 7th March, 1852.

The Negroes in Chatham are better treated than the Catholics.

REV. AND DEAR DOCTOR,—I hear from Chatham, subsequently to my appeal to your equity and to your answer, that there the negroes are

(a) The following is an extract of Lord Elgin's celebrated speech, on the occasion referred to, when he so eloquently eulogized "the excellent system of secular education provided in our Common Schools." Lord Elgin, in reply to Dr. Ryerson's address, said,—"I understand from your statements—and I come to the same conclusion from my own investigation and observation—that it is the principle of our Common School Educational System, that its foundation is laid deep in the firm rock of our common Christianity. I understand that, while the varying views and opinions of a mixed religious society are scrupulously respected—while every semblance of dictation is carefully avoided—it is desired, it is earnestly recommended, it is confidently expected and hoped, that every child who attends our Common Schools shall learn that he is a being who has an interest in eternity as well as in time. * * * I understand that, upon the broad and solid platform which is raised upon that good foundation, we invite the ministers of religion of all denominations,—the *de facto* spiritual guides of the people of the country,—to take their stand along with us." Bishop Charbonnel, at that time, so far supported the system, as to remark to Lord Elgin, that "the Institution would be one of the most glorious monuments of all that His Excellency's liberal government had raised for the prosperity of the country."

incomparably better treated than the Catholics;—that the latter have received for their separate school, attended on an average by 46 pupils, only £4 10s., Government money; and are offered as little out of about £300 taxes raised for the payment of teachers,—to which the Catholics have much contributed, as well as to the high sum levied for the building of a new school-house;—that in another mixed school the anti-Catholic history of England by Goldsmith is perused as a text book.

Again, Rev. dear Doctor, where is the equity of such a management? Where that liberal spirit professed in pamphlets, public speeches, reports, &c.? And am I not right to call our most deplorable system of education a regular disguised persecution?(b) And still I have at hand facts of a worse character.

I remain, Rev. and dear Doctor, respectfully and friendly yours,

(Signed)

+ ARM'DUS FR. MY.

Bp. of Toronto.

Rev. Dr. E. Ryerson,

Chief Superintendent of Education.

3. Dr. Ryerson to Bishop Charbonnel.

EDUCATION OFFICE,

TORONTO, 13th March, 1852.

MY LORD,—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letters of the 20th ultimo, and of the 7th instant, respecting a difference between the trustees of a separate school, and the Board of Trustees of the public schools in the town of Chatham. On the 21st ultimo, I received through the Honorable S. B. Harrison, a communication from the trustees of the separate school in the town of Chatham on the same subject.

Parental and religious rights are protected in the School System.

In respect to the complaint that Goldsmith's England is read as a text book in one of the mixed schools of Chatham, there can be no reasonable ground for it, since the 14th section of the school Act expressly provides that "no pupil in any Common school shall be required to read or to study in or from any religious book or join in any exercise of devotion or religion which shall be objected to by his or her parents or guardians." Therefore every Catholic and Protestant child is effectually protected against the use of any book, or joining in any exercise, to which his or her parents or guardians religiously object; and I presume the parties who made the complaint which you state, will not complain as a grievance that they cannot dictate as to what text books shall be used in a mixed school by the children of other parents, as long as their own children are under their own protection in this respect.

The works complained of are not sanctioned.

Though I had not heard before of the objections which you mention, to Goldsmith's very defective compendium of the History of England, the book is not sanctioned by the Council of Public Instruction; nor has any

(b) That is, of course, because the Bishop's "new ideas" were not sufficiently provided for. In 1851 he supported it, when Dr. Ryerson told Lord Elgin that the system was "free from the slightest tinge of sectarianism in its management."

elementary history been recommended to be taught in the common schools, beyond what is furnished in the admirable series of text books prepared and published by the National Board of Education for Ireland, and which are as acceptable to Roman Catholics as they are to Protestants. (c)

Regards recent demands as ominous of evil.

I have observed with regret, that demands for exemptions and advantages have recently been made on the part of some advocates of separate schools which had not previously been heard of during the whole ten years of the existence and operations of the provisions of the law for separate, as well as mixed schools. (d) I cannot but regard such occurrences as ominous of evil. It is possible that the Legislature may accede to the demands of individuals praying, on grounds of conscience, for unrestricted liberty of teaching,—exempting them from all school taxes, with a corresponding exclusion of their children from all public schools, leaving them perfectly free to establish their own schools at their own expense; but I am persuaded the People of Upper Canada will never suffer themselves to be taxed, or the machinery of their Government to be employed for the building and support of denominational school houses, any more than for denominational places of worship and clergy. (e)

National character of the School System.

Public school houses are equally the property of all classes of the school municipality in which they are erected; and there is the best assurance that schools will be perpetuated in them according to law. But there is no guarantee that a Separate School will be continued six months, as it ceases to exist legally, (at least so far as it relates to any claim upon the Public School Fund,) the moment the Public School Trustees employ in the same school division, a teacher of the same religious faith with that of the supporters of the separate school. (f)

Should the advocates of a separate school be able to claim exemption from the payment of a property-rate for the erection of a public school house, they, or any one of them at his pleasure, might, on the completion of such house, legally claim admission to it for his or their children upon the very same condition as the children of those who had been taxed to build the house. A man *may* send his children to a separate school to-day; but he has the *legal right* to send them to the public school to-morrow, if he pleases; and, as a general rule, (judging from the nature of the case, and from the experience of several years,) he will do so, as soon as he finds that his children can be as safely and more cheaply educated in the public school than in the separate one. (g) I make these remarks in reference to an objection which has been made by some of the supporters of a

(c) Few were aware until this, that Goldsmith's History was less a favorite with Catholics than with Protestants.

(d) Here was the rise of the "conscientious convictions." They were not manufactured until the beginning of 1852.

(e) The demand at this time, and which went before the Court of Queen's Bench, was to compel Municipalities to levy and collect whatever amount of taxes the Separatists demanded. The principle above indicated by Dr. Ryerson was enacted by the Legislature in 1853.

(f) Now repealed by the Roman Catholic Separate School Act of 1855.

(g) Such has been the result; and notwithstanding the continued legislation on the subject, Canadian Catholics prefer the National Schools to the schools of "foreign" ecclesiastics and "foreign" teachers.

separate school in Chatham, and in one or two other places, against being taxed for the erection of public school houses.

I herewith enclose you a copy of my reply to the trustees of the separate school in Chatham, and which I had also made to a similar communication from Belleville.

I have the honor, &c.

(Signed)

E. RYERSON.

The Right Rev. Dr. DeCharbonnel,
Roman Catholic Bishop of Toronto.

4. Bishop Charbonnel to Dr. Ryerson.

+ OAKVILLE, 24th March, 1852.

REV. DOCTOR,—In your answer to my letters, you do not say a single word about my two first complaints, viz:—the coloured people better treated in Chatham than Catholics, and the ridiculous offer of £4 10s—out of about £300 taxes raised,—for the Catholic Separate School of 45 children in the same town.

Not honorable to use defective Works.

With regard to my third complaint, you grant on one hand, that Goldsmith's History is *very defective*, therefore it does not do honor to the teachers who make use of it, and of other books of the same *defectiveness*, to my knowledge, nor to the visitors who tolerate such books in Public Schools, nor to the school system under which such *very defective* books may be used, not only against your sanction, but even *legally*.

For, you say on another hand, that there can be no *reasonable complaint* for reading that *very defective* book in mixed schools, since the 14th section of the School Act provides, that no pupil shall be required (Catholics are forced to do so in certain Schools) to read in any religious work objected to by his parents, and thereby protects all religious persuasions.

Supposes the use of certain Controversial Works by children

Therefore a Quaker book abusing Baptism, a Baptist book abusing infant Baptism, a Methodist book abusing the High Church, a Presbyterian book abusing Episcopacy, a Unitarian book abusing the Trinity of persons in God, a Socinian book abusing all Mysteries, &c. and these books may be read in the same class room of your mixed schools as well as the anti-Catholic Goldsmith's History, and that *without* any *reasonable complaint*, because no pupil is forced to read the book objected to by his parents, and thereby children of all religious persuasions are equally *protected*.

O beautiful protection! Beautiful harmony! O admirable way of teaching God and his ordinances! Admirable way of making children improve in religion, faith, piety, unity, charity, and in reading the Bible bargain!

And you are astonished, Rev. Doctor, at our demand of having no more to do with such a chimera, such a mixture, such a regular display of pyrrhonism, of indifferentism, of infidelity, and consequently of all vices and crimes! (h)

(h) The antithesis to this beautiful appeal is:—Do such things occur in the schools of "reading, writing, and arithmetic?"

Appeals against such Mongrel Interpretations.

Please tell me would you send your children to a school where your paternal authority and family prescriptions would be interpreted in ten different ways, because none of your children would be forced to read those mongrel interpretations,—and thereby they would be *protected* in their filial respect and feelings towards you? Would the Government of Canada countenance schools in which pupils could read books respecting annexationism, or any other rebellionism, because no child would be forced to read the *ism* objected by his parents, and thereby all children would be protected in their loyalty to the country and Her Majesty?

No, most certainly no; and religion alone, the basis of true individual domestic, and social happiness, will be a mockery in our public schools; or, at least, a quite indifferent abject! And you call our demand a scruple, an omen of evil! Say as well that good is evil, and evil good!

But will tolerate Mixed Schools on conditions.

Let your mixed schools be without immediate danger on the treble part of the teachers, books and fellow-pupils for the respective faith of all the children—which is seldom the case in this sectarian country,—and I will tolerate, even recommend them, as I do sometimes, through want of a better system, but always on the condition that children are religiously instructed at home or at Church; because secular instruction without a religious education is rather a scourge than a boon for a country; witness, the United States, Scotland, Sweden, Prussia, &c., where, according to statistics, infidelity, and immorality are increasing in proportion to godless education.

Approves of the National School System in Ireland.

But as long as most of your mixed schools shall be what they are, as distant from the common schools of Ireland, justly praised in your answer, as night is from the day; (i) as long as most of your mixed schools shall be a danger for the faith and morals of our children, they and we, their temporal and spiritual parents, will act according to the doctrine of the God unknown to your schools, as he was in Athens: "If thy hand, foot, eye, is an occasion of sin to thee, cut it off, pluck it out, and cast it from thee. What does it avail a man to gain the world if he lose his soul? Seek first the Kingdom of God and his Justice."

And quotes Laing and Guizot on Schools in Catholic Countries.

Now as to the boasted system of school buildings giving more security than our separate schools,—as if stones, or bricks would be better than teachers and books,—let the Scotch Protestant Laing, in his recent "Notes of a Traveller," tell "*the People of Upper Canada*," alluded to in your answer, (j) that "in Catholic countries, even in Italy, the education of the common people is *at least* as generally diffused and as faithfully promoted by the clerical body, as in Scotland. Education is in reality not only not repressed, but is encouraged by the Popish (!) Church, and is a mighty instrument in its hand and ably used." Hence the celebrated

(i) And yet these same Irish National Schools are *now* denounced, because, since then, the "foreign element" has issued a *flat* against them! See Mr. Bruyere's last letter.

(j) The sneer comes well from a foreigner, and shows how the popular character of our institutions is regarded by him.

Protestant statesman, Guizot, published lately that the far best school of respect towards authority is the Catholic school. "In every street in Rome," continues Laing, "there are, at *short distances*, public primary schools for the education of the children of the lower and middle classes in the neighbourhood. Rome, with a population of 158,678 souls, has 372 primary schools (and some more according to the official statement) with 482 teachers, and 14,000 children attending them. • Has Edinburgh so many schools for the instruction of those classes?"

And you know, Rev. Doctor, that Scotland is one of the boasted lands of common schools.

Canadian School system denounced and the war indicated.

Therefore, since your school system is the ruin of religion, and persecution of the Church; since we know, *at least* as well as any body else, how to encourage, diffuse, promote education, (Laing,) and better than you (Guizot,) how to teach respect towards authority: God and his Church, parent and Government; since we are under the blessed principles of religious liberty and equal civil right, (*k*) we must have, and we will have, the full management of our schools, as well as Protestants in Lower Canada; or the world of the 19th century will know that here, as elsewhere, Catholics, against the constitution of the country, against its best and most sacred interests, are persecuted by the most cruel hypocritical persecution.

I have the honor to be, Rev. Doctor,

Your humble and obedient servant,

(Signed,)

+ ARMPDUS. FR. MY,

Bp. of Toronto.

Rev. Dr. E. Ryerson,

Chief Superintendent of Education.

5. Dr. Ryerson to Bishop Charbonnel.

EDUCATION OFFICE,

TORONTO, 24th April, 1852.

MY LORD,—The receipt of your letter of the 24th ultimo was promptly acknowledged by Mr. Hodgins in my absence: and continued official engagements, since my return, having prevented an earlier reply, I have now to observe, that, finding your allusions to the coloured people of the town of Chatham not sustained by a communication from themselves, I did not deem it necessary to correct your mistake, or advert to the circumstance in my reply. Having received a complaint from the coloured people of Chatham, respecting their affairs, I replied to them, and wrote to the Board of School Trustees in Chatham on the same subject. I did not, therefore, think it necessary to allude further to the subject in my reply to your Lordship.

As to my alleged omission in regard to the complaints respecting the Roman Catholic School in the town of Chatham, I received a letter from the Trustees of that School, and enclosed to your Lordship a copy of my reply to their communication.

(*k*) Yes; but *only on British ground*, and under a non-Catholic government, are these rights enjoyed by foreign ecclesiastics.

Replies to General Complaints.

In regard to Goldsmith's Elementary History of England, your Lordship did not intimate that the Roman Catholic children were compelled to use it contrary to the wishes of their parents or guardians, but simply represented that it was used in the mixed school; and it was to this point that my remarks on the subject in reply were directed. I confined myself to general remarks on the point for another reason—namely: from the fact that there being a separate Roman Catholic School in Chatham, the conductors of it could have no personal interest or concern as to what text books were used in the mixed school, from all connection with which they had formally withdrawn.

As to the claim of the Trustees of the Separate School to share in the school moneys of the town of Chatham for 1851, they could not be sanctioned by law, since the school was not applied for until March of that year, and the 19th section of the School act does not permit the alteration of any School Section, or the establishment of an separate school before the 25th of December in any one year. (l.)

School system hitherto supported by Canadian Catholics:

Having thus replied to the complaints preferred by your Lordship, I would not avert to other topics which your Lordship has introduced, were not my silence liable to misconstruction, and did I not feel it my duty to defend, as well as to explain and impartially administer the Common School system which the Legislature has established in Upper Canada;—a system which has been in operation for ten years; which was cordially approved of and supported by the late lamented Roman Catholic Bishop Power; which was never objected to, as far as I know, by a single Roman Catholic in Upper Canada, during the life of the excellent Prelate and patriot, nor until a recent period.

Rise of the new Foreign Element from the Continent of Europe.

If your Lordship has thought proper, during the last twelve months, to adopt a different course, and to introduce from the Continent of Europe, a new class of ideas and feelings among the Roman Catholics of Upper Canada, in regard to schools and our whole school system, (m) I must still adhere to my frequent unqualified expressions of admiration at the opposite course pursued by your honored and devoted predecessor, Bishop Power.

Disinclination of Canadian Catholics to support it, and their reasons.

While, I may note the facts that from only three neighbourhoods in Upper Canada have demands been made by Roman Catholics, in accordance with this new movement, not sanctioned by law; that the only Roman Catholic member of the Legislative Assembly elected in Upper Canada has repeatedly declared himself opposed to the very principle of separate schools; and the only County Municipal Council in Upper Canada in which a majority of the members are Roman Catholics, has

(l) These provisions are now repealed, but were as follows:—

"Provided always that each such separate school shall go into operation at the same time with alterations in school sections."—*First Proviso, in 19th section of the School Act.*—"Provided secondly, that any alterations in the boundaries of a school section shall not go into effect before the twenty-fifth day of December next after the time when it shall have been made."—*Second Proviso in fourth clause of 18th section of the School Act.*

(m) Perhaps Mr. Bruyere will now find where the title of "foreign element" arose.

adopted resolutions against the section of the School Act which permits the establishment of separate schools under any circumstances. The facts, that, out of 3000 Common Schools, not so many as fifty separate Roman Catholic Schools have ever existed or been applied for, in any one year, in Upper Canada, and that the number of such separate schools had gradually diminished to less than thirty, until within the last twelve months, and that during ten years but one single complaint (and that during the present month) has been made to this Department of any interference with the religious faith of Roman Catholic children; and that not a Roman Catholic child in Upper Canada is known to have been proselyted to Protestantism by means of our public schools;—these facts clearly show the general disinclination of Roman Catholics in Upper Canada to isolate themselves from their fellow-citizens in school matters, any more than in other common interests of the country, and the mutually just, Christian and generous spirit in which the school as well as other common affairs of the country have been prompted by Government, by Municipal Councils, and by the people at large in their various school sections. The exceptions to this pervading spirit of the people of Upper Canada have been “few and far between;” (n) and in such cases the provision of the school law permitting the establishment of separate schools in certain circumstances, has been made use of, and just about as often by a Protestant, as by a Roman Catholic, minority in a School Municipality. (o)

Separate Schools hitherto viewed by Catholics and Protestants merely as a means of
 P. Section.

But the provision of the law for separate schools was never asked or advocated until since 1850 as a *theory*, but merely as a *protection* in circumstances arising from the peculiar social state of neighbourhoods or Municipalities. I always thought the introduction of any provision for separate schools in a popular system of common education like that of Upper Canada, was to be regretted and inexpedient; but finding such a provision in existence, and that parties concerned attached great importance to it, I have advocated its continuance,—leaving separate schools to die out, not by force of legislative enactment, but under the influence of increasingly enlightened and enlarged views of Christian relations, rights and duties between different classes of the community. I have, at all times, endeavored to secure to parties desiring separate schools, all the facilities which the law provides—though I believe the legal provision for separate schools has been, and is seriously injurious, rather than beneficial, to the Roman Catholic portion of the community, as I know very many intelligent members of that Church believe as well as myself. I have as heartily sought to respect the feelings and promote the interests of my Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, as those of any other portion of the community; and I shall continue to do so, notwithstanding the personally discourteous tone and character of your Lordship’s communication.

(n) As Mr. Bruyere admits—and this disinclination of Catholics to support the demands of the French Ecclesiastics introduced by Bishop Charbonnel, has not altered, even by threats of excommunication and the charge of mortal sins.

(o) In 1851, there were only 16 Roman Catholic Separate Schools in all Upper Canada, and in 1855, after four years’ hard fighting on the part of the “foreign element,” they had only increased to 41.

Effect of the Bishop's denunciations on Canadian Catholic Teachers.

There are, comparatively, few school divisions in Upper Canada, beyond the cities and towns, (where the Trustees have generally employed a fair proportion of Roman Catholic teachers,) in which it is possible for the Roman Catholic to maintain an efficient separate school; (p) and if your Lordship persists in representing the Common Schools maintained by the several religious classes of the community, as fraught with scepticism, infidelity and vice, the situation of Roman Catholics, sparsely scattered throughout more than 2,500 of the 3,000 school sections of Upper Canada, will be rendered unpleasant to themselves, and they will be encouraged to neglect the education of their children altogether. By the Official Returns for 1849, there were 339 Roman Catholic School Teachers employed in Upper Canada; in 1850, their number was increased to 390; and I have as cordially endeavoured to get situations for good Roman Catholic teachers as for good Protestant teachers. It is clear that the greater part of the 390 Roman Catholic teachers have been employed by Protestant Trustees and parents; but if the war of total separation in all school matters between the Protestants and Roman Catholics of Upper Canada is commenced, as proclaimed by your Lordship, many of these worthy teachers will be placed in painful circumstances, and a separation will soon begin to take place between the two portions of the community in other relations and employments.

How the Bishop demands full control of Schools.

Your Lordship says, "We must have, and we will have the full management of our schools, as well as the Protestants in Lower Canada, or the world of the 19th century will know, that here as elsewhere, Catholics, against the Constitution of the country, against its best and most sacred interests, are persecuted by the most cruel and hypocritical persecution.

Bishop's Appeal to Lower Canada—State of Matters there.

On this passage I remark, that I am not aware of Lower Canada presenting a better standard than Upper Canada of either religious or civil rights in the management of schools by any portions of the community. A popular system not yet being fully established in Lower Canada, the school system there is necessarily more despotic than here, and the Executive Government does many things there which appertain to elective Municipalities to do here; and to accomplish what is indicated by your Lordship, would involve the subversion of the Municipal system and liberties of the people of Upper Canada (q) From the beginning, Upper and Lower Canada has each had its own school system. Of the annual Legislative school grant of £50,000, Lower Canada received £29,000 per annum until 1851, (when the grant was equally divided,) and Upper Canada, £21,000; which constituted the whole of the Legislative School Fund for Upper Canada for the establishment and support of the Normal as well as the Common Schools. Upper Canada has not attempted to interfere with Lower Canada in regard to its school system,

(p) And they acknowledge this themselves;—but those "few" who think with the "foreigners," ask for the common purse of all to aid their schemes! Apart from all other considerations, such a demand shows an unworthy selfishness.

(q) These rights and liberties of our municipalities will be annihilated as Upper Canada bows to the demands of an alien, to be a Sovereign or an Ecclesiastic.

nor has Lower Canada attempted to interfere with Upper Canada in regard to its school system ; nor do I think the collision in school matters invoked by your Lordship, will be responded to by either section of United Canada : at least, for the sake of the peace and unity of Canada, I hope it may not.

Equality of Public and Separate Schools in Upper Canada.

Then as to the fact which your Lordship says will be known to "the world of the 19th century," I may observe, that the managers of the twenty-one Roman Catholic and twenty-five Protestant separate schools in Upper Canada, are placed exactly upon the same footing ; that the managers of each class of these schools have precisely the same control of them that the Trustees of Common Schools have over their schools ; that each class of Separate Schools and the Common Schools are under the same regulations ; (r) that these relations and regulations have existed for ten years with the approbation of your lamented predecessor, (who was a British colonist by birth and education, as well as feeling,) (s) and with the concurrence of both Roman Catholics and Protestants ; nor had I ever heard, before receiving your Lordship's letter, that the Government and Legislature had for so many years established and maintained, and that I, in connection with the elective Municipalities of Upper Canada, had been administering and extending a system of "the most cruel and hypocritical persecution" against any portion of the community.

Equality of their Teachers.

Nay, so perfect is the equality among teachers, as well as managers, of each class of schools, that they are all examined and classed as to intellectual attainments, by the same Board of Examination ; while the certificates of their respective Clergy are the guarantee for their religious knowledge and character. (t) This is perfect equality for the teachers of Separate Roman Catholic, or Protestant, or Common Schools ; and the great principle is maintained, that no part of the School Fund raised by, or belonging to, a Municipality shall be paid to any teacher whose qualifications are not attested by Examiners appointed by such Municipality.

Catholics protected in the right of Choice.

It is true, that no Roman Catholic or Protestant can be compelled to support a separate school, unless he applies for it or chooses to send his children to it ; and it is also true, that every Protestant or Roman Catholic has a *right* to send his children to the public school, and also the right of equal protection to his own views in regard to the religious instruction of his children. It is furthermore true, that no part of the money for separate schools is paid into the hands, and placed at the discretion, of either the Roman Catholic or Protestant clergy, but is subject to the orders in each case of the elected Trustees of separate schools in aid of

(r) "Provided always, that such separate school.....shall be under the same regulations in respect to the persons for whom such school is permitted to be established, as are Common schools generally."—*First Proviso in the 19th section of the School Act, now repealed.*

(s) This was the great secret of his patriotism, and it was that patriotism which made him the liberal supporter of Canadian Institutions and Canadian Schools.

(t) "Provided always, that no certificate of qualification shall be given to any person as a Teacher who shall not furnish satisfactory proof of good moral character."—*First Proviso in second clause of the 20th section of the School Act.* "Candidates shall not be eligible to be admitted to examination, until they shall have furnished the examiners with satisfactory evidence of their strictly temperate habits and good moral character."—*General Regulations prescribed by the Council of Public Instruction for the examination of Teachers.*

the support of teachers employed by them. But in each of these cases, I think the law secures individual protection and rights, rather than breathes the "most cruel and hypocritical persecution."

Schools therefore are not "cruel and hypocritical persecution."

There is thus no difference whatever between Protestant or Roman separate schools and mixed schools, as to the examination of teachers, on the certificates of their respective clergy; no difference as to the times at which such schools shall commence, and the legal conditions and regulations to which they are subject; no difference as to the basis of apportioning the school fund, to aid in the payment of the salaries of the teacher of each class of schools. (u) There is therefore not the slightest ground for alleging "most cruel and hypocritical persecution in regard to the one, any more than in respect to the other, class of schools; and there are "the blessed principles of religious liberty, and equal civil right," in regard to them all.

Effect of Bishop's demands.

The demand which your Lordship advocates in behalf of the Trustees of the Roman Catholic separate schools in the town of Chatham, is twofold. 1. That whatever sum or sums of money any Municipality may raise for school purposes, shall be regarded as the legal school fund of such Municipality, and be equally divided according to attendance between the public and separate school. 2. That the same principle shall be applied in the expenditure of whatever moneys may be raised for the building, repairs and furnishing of school houses; that is, that the Municipalities shall be under the same obligation to provide separate school houses as public school houses; that they shall not be able to provide for the latter without providing for the former.

Their Novelty.

Now, in regard to this demand, I have three remarks to make: 1. It is novel; it has never been made in any communication to this Department, until since the commencement of the current year. 2. It proposes a novel interpretation of the term "School Fund." The 40th section of the school Act defines it to consist in each Municipality of "the sum of money appropriated annually by the Chief Superintendent of Schools, and at least an equal sum raised by local assessment." The 27th section of the Act provides that a County Council (and the provision is applied in another part of the Act to cities, towns, and incorporated villages) can increase at its discretion the sum required to be raised by local assessment, and may apply it to increase the local school fund, or in giving special aid to the schools recommended to its favourable consideration, as it may judge expedient. (v) I never heard it doubted before, much less complained of as a grievance, that each Municipality after

(u) The following were the provisions of the law relative to the apportionment of the School Fund.—"Provided that each such separate Protestant, or Roman Catholic, or Coloured School shall be entitled to share in the school fund, according to the average attendance of pupils attending each such separate school, (the mean attendance of pupils for both summer and winter being taken,) as compared with the average attendance of pupils attending the Common Schools in such City, Town, Village, or Township."—*Third Proviso in the 19th section of the School Act.*

(v) "Provided always, that the sum or sums so levied, may be increased at the discretion of such Council, either to increase the County School Fund, or to give special or additional aid to new or needy school sections, on the recommendation of one or more Local Superintendents."—*First Proviso in the first clause of the 27th section of the School Act.*

having fulfilled the conditions of the Act, could apply at its own discretion, any additional sum or sums of money it might think proper to raise for school purposes.

Definition of the School fund, before Bishop's agitation.

I have in all past years thus explained this provision of the Act, in my correspondence with Municipal Councils; and in my letter addressed to the Provincial Secretary on the school law generally, dated 12th May, 1849, are the following words: "The School Act authorizes any Council to raise as large an amount as it pleases for Common School purposes. I have *never insisted, as the Common School Fund*, upon a larger sum in each District or Township, than that apportioned out of the Legislative grant. *Any sum over and above that amount*, which a Council may think proper to raise, may (as has been done by some Councils,) be applied in such a manner to the relief of any otherwise unprovided for poor school sections within its jurisdiction, at the pleasure of each Council." (w)

No reason to alter that decision.

What I have regarded and averred in past years to be the plain meaning of the law, and an important right of Municipalities, and that without any view to separate schools, I see no reason to unsay or undo now. Besides what the law declares to constitute the School Fund, and to whatever amount a Municipality may increase it, no part of it, as in Lower Canada, can be applied to the erection, rents, or repairs of school houses; but both the 40th and 45th Sections of our School Act expressly require that such money "shall be expended for *no other purpose* than that of paying the *salaries of qualified teachers of Common Schools*."

School Fund not applied to building School houses.

3. I remark thirdly, that as no apportionment from the Legislative school grant, or school fund, is made, and as no part of such fund can be applied for the erection, rents, repairs, or furnishing of school houses of any description, all sums expended for these purposes in any Municipality must be raised by local voluntary assessment or subscription in such Municipality.

Municipal right is the principle of the School Law.

The principle of the school law is, that each Municipality has a right to do what it pleases with its own; with what it does not receive from the Legislature; what it is not required to raise as a condition of receiving Legislative aid, but what it voluntarily provides within its own jurisdiction.

But enslavement is the principle of the foreign demands.

But if according to your Lordship's advocacy, a Municipality must be compelled to tax themselves to provide separate school houses for religious persuasions, in addition to public school houses, there may be a high degree of "civil liberty" secured to certain religious persuasions, but a melancholy slavery imposed upon the Municipalities. The liberty of teaching, any more than the liberty of preaching, by any religious persuasion, has never been understood in Upper Canada to mean the right of compelling Municipalities to provide places of teaching, any more

(w) Correspondence on the School Law of Upper Canada, printed by order of the Legislative Assembly, 1850, p. 39.

than places of preaching, for such religious persuasions. Such liberty, or rather such despotic authority, possessed by any religious persuasion, is the grave of the public Municipal liberties of Upper Canada. (x)

Vindication of Upper Canada and its people.

Your Lordship has furthermore been pleased to designate Upper Canada—the country of my birth and warmest affections—“this sectarian country;” a term which not merely implies the existence of sectarianism, (for that exists in Austria and Italy as well as in Upper Canada,) but that such is the distinguishing character of the country, as we are accustomed to say an enlightened, a civilized, or barbarous country, according to the prevailing character of its institutions and inhabitants. I think your Lordship’s designation of Upper Canada is an unmerited imputation; I am persuaded that a large majority of the people are as firm believers in “the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,” and in all that our Lord and his Apostles taught as necessary to everlasting salvation, as either your Lordship or myself. A standard English lexicographer has defined “sect” as “a party in religion which holds tenets different from those of the prevailing denomination in a Kingdom or State,” and *Becherelle* in his noble “*Dictionnaire National*,” says, after *Linguet* that “*De toutes les sectes, il n’en est pas de plus furieuses, de plus intolérantes, de plus injustes, que celles qui choisissent pour cri de guerre la religion et la liberté.*” (y) But I see no application of either of these characteristics of sectarians to the majority of the people whom your Lordship reproaches—a people, in religious morals, in honesty, industry, in enterprise, in the first and essential elements of a nation’s civilization, in advance of the mass of the people of those very states of Italy to the schools of whose capital you have drawn my attention.

And of the Christian character of its Education.

Your Lordship has represented “God as unknown to our schools as he was in Athens;” and by the passages of the scriptures which you have quoted, as well as by your remarks upon our school regulations, you intimate that I place earth before heaven, and the gain of the world before the loss of the soul. I remark, that I believe a majority of the members of the Council of Public Instruction, by whom the regulations were made for our schools in regard to religious and moral instruction, are as deeply impressed with the worth of the soul and the value of heaven, as your Lordship; and so far from God being unknown to our schools, the authorized version of His inspired Word (the text book of the religious faith of a large majority of the people of Upper Canada) is read in 2,067 out of 3,000 of them.

Bishop may propose amendments to the Council’s general regulations.

And if the regulations are criminally defective in this respect, your Lordship as a member of the Council of Public Instruction, has had, and still has ample opportunity to propose their correction and amendment.

(x) Had the Bishop been long enough in Canada, or had he studied its political history, he would have found out the sentiments of Upper Canada on the subject.

(y) “Of all sects; those are the most furious, the most intolerant, and the most unjust, who adopt as their war-cry: *Religion and Liberty.*” By a strange coincidence, these are the very words used by the Bishop.

Churches should provide Religious Instruction.

Though I have perhaps learned, by personal observation and enquiry, more of both Irish and Canadian Schools than your Lordship, and am not sensible of the vast inferiority of Canadian schools of which you speak ; yet if such be the fact in a religious point of view, the fault must lie with the clergy throughout the country, and not in the regulations, since our regulations are borrowed from those which have operated so beneficially in Ireland. Who is to provide for, and look after the religious instruction of the youth of the land, but the clergy and the churches ? Government was certainly not established to be the censor and shepherd of religious persuasions and their clergy, or to perform their duties. I lament that the clergy and religious persuasions of Upper Canada have not been more attentive to the religious instruction of youth—the youth of the land ;—but as to our youth and fellow country-men in Upper Canada not being taught to respect law and authority, as in the schools of Rome, I may observe that authority and law are maintained among us by the people themselves, without our capital being occupied by foreign armies to keep the citizens from expelling their Sovereign from the throne.(z)

Bishop's picture of controversial works imaginary.

Your Lordship draws a vivid picture of each of the children in a school being taught from a book abusing the religion of the parents of the other children. I have only to remark on this point, that the picture exists in your Lordship's imagination alone, as there is no foundation for it, in fact or probability.

Catechisms do not abuse religious persuasions.

Even should the teacher hear the children separately recite once a week the catechism of their religious persuasions, as he would hear them recite a fact in history or rule in arithmetic (without any regard to the merits of,) what your Lordship fancies could not occur even in this strongest case that can be put, as the catechism of no religious persuasion, as far as I know, consists in abusing other religious persuasions ; but in a summary of Christian faith and duty professed by its adherents. I know not of the occurrence of a case such as your Lordship has imagined in all Upper Canada during the last ten years ; and down to a recent period an increased friendly feeling and co-operation existed between Roman Catholics and Protestants—a feeling which I had hoped, and had reason to believe, until within the last twelve months, would have been promoted by your Lordship, as it was by your honored predecessor.(a)

Special information of interference required.

Your Lordship says, indeed, that " Catholics are forced in certain schools to read from religious books to which their parents object ;" but why are not the names of the places and parties mentioned ? For I can promise your Lordship a prompt and effective remedy in every case which shall be made known to this Department.

Case of Georgetown Trustees.

But it appears to me, that if such cases exist, they would be made known from the great importance and publicity which has been given to

(z) As witness Canadian loyalty and sympathy during the late European war.

(a) Canadian Catholics, who remember Bishop Power's time, know well the clerical changes effected by this " foreign influence " since then

the case of Mr. Maurice Carroll, and the School Trustees at Georgetown, in the township of Esquesing, the only case of the kind that was ever brought under the notice of this Department; and on the very day I received Mr. Carroll's letter of complaint, I answered it in strong terms of condemnation as to the proceedings of the Trustees, and in maintenance of his supremacy and inviolable rights in regard to the attendance or non-attendance of his children upon religious exercises in the school. A day or two afterwards, I repeated the same decision and views to the teacher and trustees concerned, and there the matter has ended; and it would have been the occasion of no bad feelings beyond the school section itself, had not the complaining parties, according to the advice of your Lordship, previously spread it in the newspapers, instead of first appealing to the tribunal authorised by law to decide on such matters—recourse being open to the judges of the land and the Governor General in Council, should I fail in impartiality and energy to remedy the wrong complained of.

Bishop's teaching and practice on "respect towards authority."

And I must appeal to your Lordship, and especially after your Lordship has spoken so decidedly of "respect towards authority, law and government being taught in our schools," whether it was promoting either of these objects for your Lordship to encourage Mr. Maurice Carroll, of Georgetown, to go to the newspapers, instead of the legal authorities, to remedy a legal wrong—to appeal to popular passion and religious animosities instead of first appealing to government, and exhausting the resources provided by law for legal protection against illegal oppression? (b)

Effect of the general operation of his practice.

Should the examples and counsels which your Lordship has given to Mr. Maurice Carroll, be adopted by all parties throughout the land in regard to any alleged wrong that may be committed by one party against another, what respect for law would there be? What administration of law could there be? What must be the social state of the country other than that of unbridled passion, lawlessness, and anarchy? On a matter of so much importance to the social happiness and best interests of all classes of people in Upper Canada, I confidently appeal from your Lordship under excitement, to your Lordship when calm and thoughtful. (c)

Mixed character of Guizot's School System.

Your Lordship has called my attention to the authority of Guizot, as much better than mine in school matters. I readily acknowledge the authority of that great statesman and educationist. I read his projects for school laws in France, and his various circulars to local school au-

(b) "Let your Bishop bless you and your family for your judicious, noble, paternal and quite Catholic conduct in the very painful emergency mentioned in your letter of the 29th ultimo to the Editor of the *Mirror*. Finally, through the press, you have denounced those facts to the good sense of the country, as being, in your sound opinion, after prayer, the best weapon against Satan and his agents. Honor once more to your energy, and let every Catholic be as energetic, and send to the open columns of the *Mirror* of Toronto any complaint as well grounded as yours—soon mixed schools will be what they ought to be, respectful to all sectarian persuasions—Quakers and Baptists, High and Low Church Episcopalians, and Presbyterians, Unitarians and Universalists, &c., &c., and we Catholics shall be soon placed in the same position towards the majority in this section of the Province which the Protestant minority occupies in Lower Canada."—*Bishop Charbonnel to Mr. Maurice Carroll, of Georgetown, published in the Toronto Mirror of the 9th of April, 1852.*

(c) Perhaps the Bishop, like Mr. Bruyere, in his doctrine of the relations of the parent and the State, and the parent and the Church, only made an "unintentional" mistake. The *Leader*, perhaps, might find matter for a "homily" in the above.

thorities at the time he was French Minister of Public Instruction, before I prepared my own projects and circulars; and when I found under his system, a Roman Catholic Priest, a Protestant Minister, and a Jewish Rabbi, in connection with several laymen, composing and acting harmoniously in each of the Educational Committees,—answering to our County Boards,—I did not imagine that a system based on the same principle, could be regarded as a “most cruel and hypocritical persecution,” by either Protestant or Roman Catholic in Upper Canada.

Schools in Rome—“Respect to authority”—Objects of Education.

Then your Lordship cites me to the testimony of the “Scotch Presbyterian, Laing,” in regard to the number of schools in Rome, and their tendency to promote respect to established authority. I have no wish to question the correctness of the conclusion which your Lordship would wish to establish by these references, much less to disparage the schools alluded to, many of which I have personally visited, and found them admirably conducted, and well adapted to the purposes for which they were established. But I must say, that I do not consider respect for existing authority to be the sole object of education, or of the establishment and multiplication of schools for the mass of the people. Of course, the more energetically such an object is promoted, in both Austria and Italy, and in all despotic countries, the more effectually will schools and education be employed as an instrument of despotism. I think education and schools fail to fulfil a vital part of their mission if they do not develop all the intellectual powers of man, teach him self-reliance as well as dependence on God, excite him to industry and enterprise, and instruct him in the rights as well as duties of man.

The results of Education in Italy and Scotland.

That the numerous schools of Rome and Roman Italy fail in several of these particulars, notwithstanding their efficiency in other respects, is manifest from the proverbial indolence, dishonesty, poverty, and misery of the mass of the people, notwithstanding its genial climate, the fertility of the soil, and the glory of its ancient historical recollections, while hyperborean Scotland, with its mountain heaths and glens, stands by the united testimony of travellers and historians, as far above modern Italy in all the elements of the intellectual and moral grandeur of man, as it is below it in beauty of climate and richness of soil. And this difference may be largely traced to the different systems of education in the schools and colleges of the two countries.

Bayonets in Rome and Loyalty in Edinburgh.

Your Lordship will recollect that Laing wrote before 1848, and with a view to prompt his fellow-countrymen to still greater efforts in the cause of popular education. Since Laing wrote, there has been a revolution at Rome, and the very city, the streets of which were studded with schools, expelled its Sovereign, and at this day is only kept in subjection to the existing authority, by the bayonets of France and Austria; while Edinburgh maintains an inviolable and spontaneous allegiance to its Sovereign, as deep in its religious convictions as it is fervent in its patriotic impulses. I think it right to say this much in reply to your Lordship's references to Scotland, although I have no connection with that country by natural birth or confession of faith.

Cause of this defence against the new crusade.

I have thus not rendered myself liable to blame for having passed over in silence any one of the many topics which your Lordship has thought proper to introduce ; but I have carefully noticed each of them, in a belief that your Lordship entertains defective and erroneous views of the school system and municipal institutions of Upper Canada ; with a desire of placing before you the whole question in its present and probable future bearings, before your Lordship shall enter upon the course indicated in your letter ; and from a sense of duty to successive Administrations and Parliaments that have established our Common School system, and to the Municipalities and people at large, who have so nobly sustained it, as well as from a deep consciousness of personal responsibility in this matter for the future well-being and destinies of my native land !

I have the honor, &c.

(Signed.) E. RYERSON.

The Right Rev. Dr. DeCharbonnel,
Roman Catholic Bishop of Toronto.

No. 6. Bishop Charbonnel to Dr. Ryerson.

[Translation.]

TORONTO, 1st May, 1852.

MR. SUPERINTENDENT,—My last letter, doubtless on account of my English, was neither clear nor understood, since it has caused you to address to me personalities and insinuations which I repel as unworthy of you and of me. All my previous intercourse with you and the Council of Public Instruction has been polite and christian, and sometimes tolerant to an extent that I have been required to justify. (d)

Energetic réiteration of "disguised persecution."

My last letter was energetic only after eighteen months of observation and patient representation against a school system, which my conscience, as a Catholic Bishop, rejects, with all my might, for the souls confided to me ; a system which, notwithstanding your explanations, I repeat fearlessly, and irrespective of any person, is, for us Catholics, a disguised persecution, unanimously and strenuously condemned by other Bishops as well as myself.

Foreign ecclesiastical decrees invoked.

For I read, first in the acts of the Provincial Councils of Baltimore, (pages 84 and 117), sanctioned by the Supreme Head of our Church, one and universal:

Council Prov. Balt. 1, Can. XXXIV—"Whereas very many youth of Catholic parents, especially among the poor, have been and still are, in many parts of this Province, exposed to great danger of losing their faith, and having their morals corrupted, from the want of proper teachers to whom so important a trust can be safely confided ; we judge it indispensably necessary to establish schools, in which youth may be nurtured in the principles of faith and morals, while they are instructed in literature."

(d) Ave! perhaps there was behind the scenes a foreign compulsion of the "foreign element," to compel Canadian Catholics to forego their previous sympathies, and adopt the new "convictions."

Can. XXXV.—“Since not unfrequently many things are found in the books which are generally used in the schools, in which the principles of our faith are impugned, our dogmas falsely expounded, and history itself perverted : on account of which the minds of the young are imbued with errors, to the terrible loss of their souls ; zeal for religion, as well as the proper education of youth, and the honor itself of the American Union, demand that some remedy be provided for so great an evil. Therefore we determine, that there shall be published for the use of schools, as soon as possible, books entirely expurgated from errors, and approved by the authority of the Bishops, and in which nothing may be contained which might produce enmity or hatred to the Catholic faith.”

Council Prov. Balt. IV., Can. VI.—“As it appears that the system of public instruction, in most of the Provinces is so devised and administered as to encourage heresies and gradually and imperceptibly to fill the minds of Catholic youth with errors, we admonish pastors, that with the utmost zeal they watch over the Christian and Catholic education of Catholic youth, and to take especial pains lest such youth use the Protestant version of the Scriptures, or recite the hymns or prayers of the Sectaries. It must be carefully provided, that no books or exercises of this kind be introduced in the Public Schools, to the danger of faith and piety.”(e)

Now these Canons are the perfect expression of our sentiments.

Dr. Murray against the former (Kildare Place) poor school system of Ireland.

I read, secondly, in the correspondence of that great Archbishop whom the whole Church laments, the mediator between Ireland and England, the dove of Dublin :

“In Ireland it was required that, in all the schools for the education of the poor, the Bible, without notes, should be read in the presence of all the pupils of the schools, and that the Catechism and all books of that kind should be excluded.”

Is not this the case in our Mixed Schools?

“These regulations,” continued the incomparable Dr. Murray, “our Bishops *resisted* and *endeavored* most earnestly to *withdraw* the Catholic pupils from schools of that kind..... That a remedy might be provided for this most wretched state of things, our Government, *strongly* urged by me and others, at length decided to adopt another system of educating the poor, which would be more *acceptable to the Catholics.*”(f)

Bishop's appeal for a system worthy of the “vaunted American and Canadian liberalism.”

Suffer me, then, Mr. Superintendent, to obey God rather than man, and to *resist*, as did the loyal and conciliating Archbishop, your unhappy School system, try to rescue from it my dear children, and to remedy this scourge by urging our Government to give us a system which will be acceptable to us—a system which shall not render the condition of the Irish *here* worse than it is in Ireland—a system worthy of American or

(e) And yet in no State of America have Separate Catholic Schools been granted. The demand was met by a political organization which swept the continent like a whirlwind.

(f) And that very system, so established by Archbishop Murray, and still supported by the liberal Catholics of Ireland, is now denounced by his ultramontane successor ; as is the very same system in Canada now denounced by the alien successor of Bishop Power.

Canadian liberalism, so much vaunted (*g*) in the world : unless Upper Canada prefers to continue, what I cannot, in strict logic, call anything but a cruel and disguised persecution.

But offers conditions of acceptance.

I have said, that if the Catechism were sufficiently taught in the family or by the pastor, so rare in this large diocese ; and if the Mixed Schools were exclusively for secular instruction, and without danger to our Catholics, in regard to masters, books and companions, the Catholic Hierarchy might tolerate it, as I have done in certain localities, after having made due enquiry.

And declares penalties against Catholics.

Otherwise, in default of these conditions, it is forbidden to our faithful to send their children to these schools, on pain of the refusal of the sacraments : because the soul and heaven are above everything ; because the foot, the hand, the eye, occasions of sin, ought to be sacrificed to salvation, because finally, Jesus Christ has confided the mission of instruction, which has civilized the world, to no others than the Apostles and their successors to the end of time.

Claims of foreign ecclesiastical sovereignty.

It is their right so sacred and inalienable, that every wise and paternal Government has made laws respecting instruction only in harmony with the teaching Church—the Bishops united to their supreme and universal Head ; and this right is so inviolable, that of late, as well as in former times, in France, in Belgium, in Prussia, in Austria, as in Ireland, (*h*) the Bishops, with the Pope, have done everything to overthrow or modify every School or University system opposed to the mission given by Jesus Christ to his sacred College.

“Go therefore teach all nations, and preach to every creature, (St. Mark) teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you ; and lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world (St. Matthew). He that believeth shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be condemned.” (St. Mark)

I have the honor to be,

Mr. Superintendent,

Your humble and obedient servant,

(Signed,)

† ARM'D FR. MY.

Bishop of Toronto.

The Rev. Egerton Ryerson, D.D.,
Chief Superintendent of Education.

No. 7. Dr. Ryerson to Bishop Charbonnel.

EDUCATION OFFICE,

TORONTO, 12th May, 1852.

MY LORD,—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 1st instant ; and as your Lordship has not thought proper to

(*g*) It did not need this sneer to show the Bishop's antipathies to our free institutions.

(*h*) And are doing the same there now against the system they formerly supported.

notice the perfect equality which I shewed in my letter of the 24th ultimo, to exist between Protestant and Roman Catholic Separate Schools in Upper Canada, nor indeed any of the facts and reasons I have adduced to shew the equal rights and protection of Roman Catholics with all other classes of the community under one common school system; and its harmony with the free Institutions of our country, in reply to the statements and attacks contained in your letter of the 24th of March, it is not necessary that I should discuss these topics again, further than I may have occasion to allude to them in answer to some portions of your Lordship's letter now before me.

Former intercourse with Bishop.

Your Lordship refers to the friendly and cordial character of the intercourse which has taken place from time to time between your Lordship and the other members of the Council of Public Instruction, including myself. I can assure your Lordship that the feelings of respect and pleasure attending that intercourse, could not have been greater on your part than on mine; and I therefore felt greatly surprised, pained and disappointed, when I read your Lordship's letter of the 24th of March, denouncing that whole system of Public Instruction which I had understood your Lordship to be a colleague in promoting; attacking the principles on which I have acted during the whole period of my official connection with that system; impugning the motives of its founders; reflecting upon the character of the people of Upper Canada; and advocating that which would be subversive of their hitherto acknowledged rights of local self-government. (i)

Disclaims unworthy personalities.

In my reply to that letter, I disclaim having cherished a feeling or intended a remark in the slightest degree personally disrespectful to your Lordship; but I felt it my duty to answer explicitly and fully your Lordship's statements, reasonings, and references; and if I said anything, (of which I am unconscious,) which can be characterized as unworthy "personalities or insinuations" it was said in reply to much stronger and more pointed remarks of the same character contained in your Lordship's letter of the 24th of March. I had hoped that a full exposition of the civil and Municipal institutions of this country, and their equal fairness and application to all religious persuasions and classes of people in regard to our Common School system, would satisfy your Lordship that, whether perfect or imperfect, our school system is based upon the principles of equal justice and rights to both Protestant and Roman Catholic, and that you had been quite mistaken in pronouncing it a system of "most cruel and hypocritical persecution" against the Roman Catholics.

Regrets Bishop's continued hostility.

I regret that I have been unable to produce any change in your Lordship's views as to our system of Public Instruction, or in your avowals of hostility to it; but I shall not fail, nevertheless, to conduct myself towards your Lordship personally, with the same respect and courtesy which I have endeavored to observe in all my previous intercourse with you.

(i) The Bishop, however, either did not see the logical conclusion of his agitation, or else did not care.

Bishop's repetition of charges in French letter.

I think that no erroneous impression was conveyed or disadvantage experienced, by your Lordship's having written your letter of the 24th March, in English; since your letter of the 1st instant expresses the same sentiments, in still stronger terms, on these very points, respecting which I might have been supposed to misapprehend your meaning. Your Lordship again designates our school system, "a disguised persecution against Roman Catholics"—"*pour nous Catholiques une persecution deguisee;*" and in another place you call it, "a cruel and disguised persecution"—"*une persecution cruelle et deguisee.*"

And must therefore be considered a persecutor.

These representations and assertions your Lordship repeats, against the irrefragable proofs which I have adduced to the contrary,—against the notorious fact that, under our school system, Roman Catholics not only enjoy equal protection and advantages with every other portion of the community, but a privilege in regard to Separate Schools, which is not granted to any one religious persuasion of Protestants, in either Upper or Lower Canada. In view of such facts, your Lordship's reiterated assertions, in connection with the object for which they are made, must be regarded, I will not say as you have said "a cruel and disguised persecution," but an act of great injustice to the Legislators and people of Upper Canada; a contradiction to the conduct of your lamented predecessor, the late Bishop Power; and an invasion of the rights of property and municipalities which have been regarded as inviolable. I think therefore that your Lordship has assumed the position of the persecutor, rather than the Legislature and Municipalities of Upper Canada.

Councils of Baltimore do not apply to Canadian Schools.

Your Lordship says that our School System is unanimously and strenuously condemned by other Roman Catholic Bishops than yourself, and in proof, you quote certain Acts of the Provincial Councils of Baltimore, which, you state, have been sanctioned by the Pope; but I can find nothing in the Acts quoted, which can be fairly applied to our Schools. As to the first of the Acts of the Provincial Councils of Baltimore, quoted by your Lordship, no proof can be adduced, that the operations of our schools in all past years, have exposed to great peril the faith and morals of the children of Catholic parents (*j*). In regard to the second of the Acts referred to, whatever may be said to the books introduced by public authority into some of the Schools of the United States to which this Act refers, no school book has been sanctioned by the Council of Public Instruction for Upper Canada, in which there is a paragraph that impugns the principles of the Roman Catholic faith, or erroneously interprets its dogmas, much less falsifies the facts of history, since the only series of books for use in our schools, are those which have been introduced into the National Schools in Ireland, with the concurrence of the lamented Dr. Murray, to whom your Lordship refers in just terms of praise and admiration. (*k*)

(*j*) The charge, however—without condescending to prove it—is still reiterated—as see Mr. Bruyere's letters.

(*k*) And which the Bishop, as a member of the Council of Public Instruction, aided in recommending.

School System does not judge of heresies.

And in respect to the last Act quoted by your Lordship, (setting forth among other things, that the system of public education is so devised and conducted as to foster heresies, and gradually and imperceptibly fill the minds of Roman Catholic youths with the false principles of the Sectaries, and that the Priest must watch diligently lest such youth should read the Protestant version of the Scriptures, or recite the hymns or prayers of the Sectaries,) I remark, that our system of Public Instruction knows nothing of the different religious opinions which exist in the country; does not pretend to judge what are heresies, or what parties are heretics; nor does it favor one class of religious opinions more than another; nor does it require Roman Catholic children to read the Protestant version of the Holy Scriptures, or hear, much less "recite the prayers or hymns of the Sectaries;" although I know of Roman Catholic schools, the authorities of which, require Protestant youth attending them to be present at the recital of Roman Catholic prayers and hymns, and alleging, at the same time, that there is not, nor shall there be, any interference with the religious principles of such youth. (1)

Bishop mistaken about Irish and Canadian Schools.

Your Lordship quotes the words of the late Dr. Murray, late Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, who, referring to the former School system in Ireland, under the direction of a body called the Kildare Place Society, says, "it was required that in all the Schools for the education of the poor, the sacred Scriptures, without note or comment, should be read in the presence of all pupils of the Schools;" and you then ask me if this is not the case in our Mixed Schools? I answer—it is not the case. We have no regulation that requires any book whatever to be read before all the children of any one of our Mixed Schools; nor does our School law permit any School authority whatever to require the attendance of Roman Catholic or Protestant pupils at the reading of any book, or the recital of any hymn or prayer to which the parents or guardians of such pupil shall object.

Relations of our Government in matters of Religion.

Our Government does not assume, or pretend to the right of assuming, the power of commanding or prohibiting any portion of the population of Upper Canada in matters of religion; what it recommends in respect to moral example and instruction in the Schools, is common to all, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, Jew and Christian,—each and all of whom recognize the Ten Commandments; but as to religious instruction, it is left to the discretion of the parties and parents concerned in each School Division; for, as Jehovah does not authorize any one human being to lord it over the faith of another human being, but makes every man personally accountable, and therefore gives him an equal right with every man to judge and act for himself in the matters of his eternal salvation, so our law does not permit any parent his child to be lorded over by others in matters of religious faith, instruction, or devotion.

Irish National System identical with Canadian System.

Your Lordship further quotes Dr. Murray, in saying that he and the other Roman Catholic Bishops in Ireland, most earnestly resisted the

(1) The Editor of this has lately visited mixed schools in Lower Canada and found the reading books there devoted to nothing else but expositions of the Roman Catholic faith.

former (Kildare Place) system of poor Schools in Ireland, and at length prevailed upon the Government to establish another (the present National) system which would be more acceptable to the Roman Catholics. Now, the very system which was thus established in Ireland in regard to books and religious instruction, and which Dr. Murray supported to the end of his life, is that which is established in Upper Canada, as I stated in my last letter to your Lordship, as may be seen by comparing our general School regulations(*m*) with those which Dr. Murray, and other members of the National Board of Education, have established in Ireland, (*n*) and which I quoted at length in my correspondence on the School Law of Upper Canada, printed in 1850, by order of the Legislative Assembly, (a copy of which was sent you) pages 52 and 53. Therefore, if your Lordship followed the example of the incomparable Dr. Murray, as well as that of the late Bishop Power, you would give your cordial support to a system of Schools which you are now denouncing as "a cruel and disguised persecution."(*o*)

American States do not recognize Councils of Baltimore.

In regard to the acts or resolutions of the Roman Catholic Provincial Councils of Baltimore, quoted by your Lordship, I have two additional remarks to offer: The one is, that no Legislature of any free State of the American confederacy has established or given a farthing's aid for the establishment of a class of denominational elementary Schools, either Protestant or Roman Catholic, such as are referred to, and such as your Lordship is demanding in Upper Canada. I know of but two instances of any formal effort or demand being made upon an American State Legislature for that purpose: the one was made a few years since by Archbishop Hughes of New York, but failed of success; and the other is now being made in the State of Maryland. (*p*)

How Sectarian Schools are supported there.

Wherever such denominational elementary schools exist in the neighbouring States, they are wholly supported by the religious persuasion

(*m*) "In any Model or Common School established under this Act, no child shall be required to read or study in or from any religious book, or to join in an exercise of devotion or religio which shall be objected to by his or her parents or guardians: Provided always, that within this limitation pupils shall be allowed to receive such religious instructions as their parents or guardians shall desire, according to the general regulations which shall be provided according to law."—*School Act of 1850*.

1. The public religious exercises of each school shall be a matter of mutual voluntary arrangement between the Trustees and Teacher; and it shall be a matter of mutual arrangement between the parent or guardian of each pupil as to whether he shall hear such pupil recite from the Scriptures, or Catechism, or other summary of religious doctrine and duty of the persuasion of such parent or guardian. Such recitations, however, are not interfere with the regular exercises of the school.—*Canadian Regulations*. This clause was cordially approved by Bishop Power.—See note (*s*) on page 32.

(*o*) "Archbishop Murray, so long the ornament of his church and country, was one of our original members; and our success has been greatly owing to his presence amongst us, and to the confidence reposed by the members of his church in his great sense, experience and integrity. He was strongly convinced that our system was one of the greatest blessings ever conferred on the people of Ireland; and one of the last acts which preceded the close of his life was to assist, at the age of eighty-three years, at a meeting of our Board."—*Eighteenth Report of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, for 1852*.

(*p*) A gentleman in Maryland, in writing to the editor at the time, stated that "the public disapproval of the provisions of the bill has been manifested to such an extent that I think it hardly probable the bill will again be called up."

(*n*) The patrons of the several schools have the right of appointing such religious instruction as they may think proper to be given therein: provided that each school be open to children of all communions; that due regard be had to parental right and authority; that, accordingly, no child be compelled to receive, or be present, at any religious instruction to which his parents or guardians object; and that the time for giving it be so fixed that no child shall be thereby, in effect, excluded, directly or indirectly, from the other advantages which the school affords. Subject to this, religious instruction may be given, either during the fixed school hours or otherwise.—*Irish National Regulations*.

establishing them ; nor are the members of such persuasion exempted, nor have I ever heard of their asking exemption, on that account, from paying, with others, all taxes required for the erection of public School Houses, and the support of the public Schools. Nay, I have reason to believe that, notwithstanding the Acts of the Councils quoted by your Lordship, the opposition of the Roman Catholic Bishops and Clergy to public Schools in the neighbouring States is very partial, if it exists at all, in many places.

Catholic Bishop of Boston's reply to foreign Ecclesiastics.

When in Boston a few months since, I learned on good authority, that the Roman Catholic Bishop of that Diocese, when applied to by certain priests, lately from Europe, to interpose in arresting what they considered the great injury being done to the religious faith of Roman Catholic children, by attending the public Free Schools, replied, that he would do nothing of the kind, that he received his early education in those Schools ; that he would never have attained his present position but for the Boston system of Free Schools. I cannot but be deeply impressed with the conviction that it would be a great blessing to the Roman Catholic youth of Upper Canada, if the Roman Catholic Bishop of Toronto would imitate the example of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Boston. But that is a matter which rests with your Lordship, and not with me, to decide.

What is the authority of the Baltimore Councils ?

My second remark is, that the acts of the Provincial Councils referred to, are those of Ecclesiastics alone, and of Foreign Ecclesiastics ; and although your Lordship may refer to them as the commands of God, they cannot be viewed by others as possessing any more authority, or entitled to any higher consideration, than acts and resolutions on the same subjects adopted by a Protestant Episcopal Convention, or Presbyterian Synod, or Methodist Conference, and approved by the Bishop, or Moderator, or President of these religious persuasions respectively.

Legislators not the Agents of Ecclesiastical Bodies.

I likewise observe that your Lordship makes no reference to the opinions of the laity on this subject ; but we should not forget, whatever may be one's own wishes, that our Legislators and Municipalities in Upper Canada, and our responsible Ministers of the Crown, are not the agents of any body of Ecclesiastics, foreign or domestic, but the elected and responsible Representatives of the whole people, including both clergy and laity ; and the references in my last letter shew that your Lordship is far from representing the unanimous sentiments of even that portion of the Upper Canada lay electors who belong to your own church, any more than those of your lamented predecessor in office.

Charges of Injustice.— Actual Facts of the case.

In regard to the alleged injustice done to Roman Catholics in the distribution of school moneys, so frequently asserted by your Lordship, there is one circumstance which I may mention in addition to the facts and reasons I have given in reply to your Lordship's statements and claims. The Board of School Trustees in the city of Toronto have caused a very careful inquiry to be made into the census returns and tax rolls of

the city, in order to ascertain the comparative amount of taxes paid by Roman Catholics and Protestants. The result of that inquiry is, that while *one fourth* of the entire population of the city is returned as Roman Catholics, a fraction less than *one-twelfth* of the taxes is paid by them ;(g) and I presume the wealth of the Roman Catholics, in proportion to their numbers, compares as favorably as that of Protestants in the city of Toronto, as in any other Municipality in Upper Canada.

Roman Catholics benefited by National School System.

It is, therefore, clear that no class of the population is so much benefited by the General School taxes, in proportion to what they pay, as Roman Catholics ; and hence assuming,—what the people and Legislature of Upper Canada have repeatedly repudiated—that the authority and officers of law ought to be employed to impose and collect taxes for any religious denomination, the sums of school money which would be payable, when apportioned upon the basis of property, to Roman Catholic Separate Schools, would be much less than what the School Act now allows such schools upon the basis of the attendance of pupils. Of all classes in the community, the Roman Catholics have the strongest reason to desire the system of Mixed Schools ; and every effort to urge them to apply for Separate Schools, so far as it succeeds, imposes upon them additional pecuniary burdens, at the same time that it must inflict upon them losses and disadvantages to which they are not now subject.

Bishop's Conditions.

Your Lordship says that “if the catechism of your Church were properly taught in the family and by the priest, so rare in this vast Diocese, and if the mixed School were confined exclusively to secular instruction, and without danger to Roman Catholic youth, in regard to masters, books and companions, the Roman Catholic hierarchy might tolerate it ; but that, in the absence of these conditions, Roman Catholic parents are forbidden to send their children to the Schools under pain of the refusal of the sacraments.”

Appeal against its Results on Catholic children

May I, my Lord, become the advocate of thousands of children of your own Church before you carry into effect the purpose here avowed ? A child cannot remain in ignorance of his catechism without criminal neglect of duty on the part of both his parents and priest ; but if these are guilty of inflicting upon the child one injury, is your Lordship to inflict upon that unfortunate child the additional injury of prohibition of all secular instruction,—adding the curse of intellectual to that of spiritual ignorance ? I hope, upon the grounds of humanity itself, this may not be the case !

Bishop's Change of Sentiment.

As to the Schools being exclusively confined to secular instruction, I am somewhat surprised that your Lordship should insist upon this, after having alleged, in a former letter, as a reproach against our schools,

(g) The Trustees of the Roman Catholic Separate Schools in Toronto claimed £1,150 for their schools, and in reporting upon this demand the Committee of the Board of School Trustees state that—“From a recent return your Committee find that the total *annual value* of the taxable property in the city amounts to £186,933 5s.—of this, the proportion held by Roman Catholics is £16,750 10s. The total net amount of school tax for last year, at $\frac{2}{3}$ d. in the pound, was £1,800: the nett proportion contributed by the Roman Catholic inhabitants was £156 10s.”—*Report of Free School Committee of the Board of School Trustees for the City of Toronto, dated 19th May, 1852.*

that God was as unknown in them as he was in ancient Athens; but I have already shown that a child cannot receive any other than secular instruction, unless in accordance with the wishes of his parent or guardian; and that there is the same regard to parental religious rights and wishes in respect to books. And in respect to masters and companions, I may add, that I am not aware of Roman Catholic masters or youth possessing any superiority over Protestant masters and youth, in respect to either morals or manners.

His infliction of Ignorance on the Child.

It appears, then, that no censure is to be inflicted upon the parent or priest for neglecting his duty in teaching the child the catechism; nor is the parent threatened with any censure if he altogether neglects to send his child to the school; but he is to be refused the sacraments if he sends his child without the catechism having been taught such child, or if there be anything in the master, or the books, or the pupils of the School, which may not receive the sanction of the Ecclesiastical *surveillance* established. I cannot but see, that the carrying out of such a system on the part of your Lordship, must place the Roman Catholic youth of Upper Canada, in a deplorable condition, and doom their descendants to a hopeless inferiority in comparison with other classes of their fellow-citizens. I feel that I am not exceeding my duty in speaking plainly and strongly on this point, since the educational interests of all classes have been intrusted to my care, and I am bound by official as well as Christian and patriotic considerations, to do all in my power to prevent any single child in Upper Canada from growing up in ignorance, and therefore in a state of vassalage and degradation, in our free country.

Bishop's claims of Supremacy.

I notice, finally, the avowal with which your Lordship's letter concludes,—containing an expression of sentiment and statement of facts which I have often seen ascribed to the authorities of your Church, but which I have never before seen so broadly and explicitly avowed by any of its dignitaries,—an avowal which I could not have credited did it not appear over your Lordship's own signature. Your Lordship says, that “Jesus Christ has confided the mission of instruction which has civilized the world, only to the apostles and their successors, to the end of time. It is their right, so sacred and so inalienable, that every wise and paternal Christian government has made laws in regard to instruction only in harmony with the teaching Church,—the Bishops united to their universal and supreme head; and this right is so inviolable, that recently, as heretofore, in France, in Belgium, in Prussia, in Austria, as in Ireland, the Bishops with the Pope, have done all in their power to overthrow or modify every School or University system which is in opposition to the mission given by Jesus Christ to His sacred College.”

What they are; and what is the duty of Upper Canada in regard to them.

It is here clearly claimed, “that the Pope and Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church are the only persons authorized by God himself to direct the education of youth, and therefore, that all others undertaking that work are invading the prerogative of God; that all legislation on the subject must have the sanction of “the Bishops with the Pope;” and that they have done, and will do, all in their power to overthrow or

modify every system of public instruction, from the School to the University, which is not under their control. Such being your Lordship's sentiments and intentions, I am glad that you have frankly avowed them. The people of Upper Canada and their representatives will at once understand their position and duty.

Bishop's appeal to "religious liberty and equal rights."

But, in view of such avowals and references, I am surprised that your Lordship should have invoked "the blessed principles of religious liberty and equal rights," since, in connection with the sentiments above avowed, there can be no religious liberty or rights except for the "Bishops and the Pope;" and since they denounce the doctrine of "religious liberty and equal rights" as an awful heresy in the Roman States, and will not allow to Protestants even liberty of worship or teaching, much less aid from the State for that purpose, as your Lordship demands in behalf of the Roman Catholic Schools in Upper Canada.

Has fully informed the Bishop of our institutions.

In conclusion, I may observe, that whatever may be the result of this correspondence, I shall have the satisfaction of knowing that I have not left your Lordship uninformed as to any feature of our civil and municipal institutions involved in the question; and of their perfect fairness, and the equality of their application, to both Roman Catholics and Protestants; of the protection and security of the members of all religious persuasions, in regard to the peculiarities of faith, and therefore, the utter groundlessness of your Lordship's imputations, and the unreasonableness of your claims upon the ground of "religious liberty and equal rights."

Will the European crusade be transferred to Upper Canada?

Indeed the passage above quoted from your Lordship's last letter shows that the claims set up by your Lordship are not merely for "religious liberty and equal rights," but for the absolute supremacy and control on the part of your Bishops with the Pope, in our system of public instruction. As Belgium, France, and some other countries in Europe, have been disturbed for many years by the efforts of some of your Bishops for the direction of systems of public education, and the various grades of Schools and Colleges, so may Upper Canada be disturbed in like manner to some extent, by the efforts of your Lordship; but I doubt whether such efforts will meet with much sympathy from a large portion of the members of the Roman Catholic Church; as I am persuaded they will not from the people of Upper Canada at large. I can appeal to the history of the past in proof of my acting towards the Roman Catholic Church in the same spirit as towards any other church; but I must be unfaithful to all my past precedents, as well as to the trust reposed in me, and the almost unanimous feeling of the country, if I should not do all in my power to resist—come from what quarter it may—every invasion of "the blessed principles of religious liberty and equal rights," among all classes of the People of Upper Canada!

I have the honor, &c.

(Signed)

E. RYERSON.

The Right Rev. Dr. DeCharbonnel,
Roman Catholic Bishop of Toronto.

No. 8. Bishop Charbonnel to Dr. Ryerson.

SATURDAY, 22nd May, 1852.

Bishop went upset the Government of Canada.

REV. DOCTOR,—The conclusion of our Correspondence must be that our opinions on Separate Schools are quite different.

But I hope that by making use of all constitutional means, in order to obtain our right, I will not upset the Government of Canada, nor its institutions.

I have the honor, &c.
(Signed)

× ARM'DUS FR. MY.,
Bp. of Toronto.

Rev. Dr. E. Ryerson,
Chief Superintendent of Education.

No. 9. Bishop Carbonnel to Judge Harrison.

26th May, 1852.

MR. PRESIDENT.—I beg to state, that, if a correspondence, exchanged between the Rev. Dr. Ryerson and me, has come to the cognizance of your Council, it had no reference at all to my intercourse with your deliberations and resolutions. My conscientious attendance at them, when sojourning in Toronto; my conduct at the laying of the corner stone of the Normal School; and some of my letters to the Rev. Doctor, are evidences of my feelings towards a body from which I receive nothing but courtesy and kindness. Hence I wrote to his Reverence on the 20th February last, "my visitation through the Diocese convinces me more and more that the good spirit of our Council of Public Instruction is far from being prevalent in certain localities;" and on the 30th last, after having received from his Reverence 23 pages in folio of personalities and insinuations unworthy of him and of me, I replied: "all my precedents with you, Reverend Doctor, and the Council of Public Instruction, have been polite and Christian, and sometimes of a tolerance for which my Church made me responsible.(g)"

Were I not leaving town again, Mr. President, I would ask of your kindness a special meeting, in which I would lay before your Council all my complaints on the operation of the proviso for Separate Schools, and the course I followed to stop the annihilation of that boon by a system which I cannot but call a disguised persecution, come from what quarter it may.

I have the honor, &c.
(Signed,)

+ ARM'DUS FR. MY.,
Bp. of Toronto.

Judge Harrison,
President of the Council of
Public Instruction, Toronto.

(g) Foreign compulsion acknowledged. Is that the way Upper Canadian Catholics are to be driven?

No. 10. Dr. Ryerson to Bishop Charbonnel.

EDUCATION OFFICE,
TORONTO, 31st May, 1852.

MY LORD,—The Honorable S. B. Harrison has transferred to me your letter of the 26th instant, addressed to him as Chairman of the Council of Public Instruction for Upper Canada; the subject of your letter not coming within the duties prescribed by law to that body, but relating to the duties and conduct of the Chief Superintendent of Education.

Relations as Chief Superintendent and member of the Council.

I should very imperfectly understand my duties, were I to trouble the Council of Public Instruction with the voluminous correspondence of this Department, except the communications which I make at the request of the Council, or such as I receive to be laid before it. As a member of the Council of Public Instruction, as well as of the Senate of the University of Toronto, I am only one of the body consisting of several members; but as Chief Superintendent of Education for Upper Canada, I have distinct duties to discharge, and in respect to which I am responsible to my Sovereign through Her Representative. The several clauses of the 36th section of the School Act, prescribe the duties of the Council of Public Instruction; and the several clauses of the 35th section prescribe my duties. It is my general duty to see that every part of the School law is duly executed; and specially "to see that all moneys apportioned by me are applied to the objects for which they were granted; and for that purpose to decide upon all matters and complaints submitted to me, which involve the expenditure of any part of the School Fund." The 34th Section of the Act provides, that I "shall be responsible to, and subject to the direction of, the Governor General." (r)

Responsibility as Chief Superintendent.

If your Lordship, therefore, has complaints to make of my official conduct, the way is open; and I am prepared at any moment to answer to the authority by which I have been appointed, and to the country on whose behalf I have laboured, for my official acts.

Notice of every meeting of the Council of Public Instruction is invariably sent to the residence of your Lordship; and at any such meeting, (as I have stated in my two last letters,) your Lordship has, of course, the right of bringing before the members of the Council any subject that you may think proper; and should your Lordship desire it, I shall be happy to call a special meeting of the Council to suit your Lordship's convenience.

It now becomes my duty, my Lord, to advert to the personal imputations which your Lordship has been pleased to make against me, in your letter to the Honorable Mr. Harrison.

Disclaims charge of personality.

Not to notice the unofficial character of such personal imputations in such a letter, I may observe, that the statement of your Lordship is calculated to convey a very erroneous impression of the facts relative to what your Lordship is pleased to term my "personalities and insinua-

(r) It is evident that the Bishop either did not study our school system, or, perhaps, could not comprehend it, from his want of knowledge of the country and of our free system of government.

tions;" while your drawing attention from the questions which your Lordship has voluntarily raised, and from your Lordship's own attacks upon our Schools and School law, to a matter of alleged personal discourtesy in my letter to your Lordship, is what I did not expect, and what I can hardly conceive to be "worthy of your Lordship or of me."

Your Lordship's letter to Mr Harrison conveys the impression that I addressed to you "23 pages, in folio, of unworthy personalities and insinuations," in reply to your letter of the 20th February last. Your Lordship must be aware that this is not the case; and I regret that the language of your letter is calculated to do me an act of gross injustice. Permit me, therefore, my Lord, to state the facts of the case.

Recapitulation of Correspondence.

On the 20th of February, your Lordship addressed me a letter (dated "Irishtown") recommending to my favorable attention the petition of the Roman Catholic School Trustees of Chatham. On the 7th of March, your Lordship addressed me another short letter (dated "London,") on the same subject. On the 23rd of February, I replied to the Roman Catholic Trustees of Chatham; and my official duty required me to do no more, as it is not usual in Public Departments to correspond on questions of complaint with others than the complaining parties themselves. But I did more; out of respect to your Lordship, in an official letter, dated the 13th March, I enclosed you a copy of my reply to the Roman Catholic Trustees of Chatham; and in reply to your letters of the 20th of February and the 7th of March, I briefly explained the law in reference to the use of Books in the Schools—the rights of parents in regard to them—the wholly unobjectionable character, on religious grounds, of the books which the Council of Public Instruction had recommended—and the claims which the Roman Catholic Trustees of Chatham had made for a portion of the local Municipal Assessment to build their separate School-houses, and for exemption from Municipal Assessments for the erection of Public School-houses.

Your Lordship cannot but admit that this letter, with its enclosure, could not have been dictated by any other than a feeling of respect for your Lordship personally and officially, and with a strict regard to the principles and operations of the School system as established by law. But what was the result?

Bishop's scorn and ridicule of School system.

The result was, as your Lordship cannot, I am sure, forget, letter dated—"Oakville, 24th March, 1852," in which your Lordship treated with sarcasm, ridicule and scorn, my letter of the 13th March relative to the School law; employed "personalities and insinuations," such as I had never before received from any Clergyman; charged our Schools with being the nurseries of "all vices and crimes;" contrasted the character and tendencies of Primary Schools in Canada, the United States, Ireland, Scotland and Rome; denounced our whole "School System as the ruin of religion, and a persecution for the Roman Catholic Church," and those who had established that system as carrying on against the Roman Catholics a "most cruel and hypocritical persecution." I must have been destitute of the feelings of a Canadian or a patriot, not to have felt on the perusal of such a letter from your Lord-

ship, under such circumstances ; but I delayed answering it until I could do so after calm and mature consideration, and then I replied distinctly to each of the numerous counts, (personal and public) of your Lordship's indictment. And my answer to the many charges and insinuations of such a letter, your Lordship is pleased to represent as a reply to your short letter of the 20th of February, and as "23 pages of personalities and insinuations unworthy of you and of me."

Bishop's avowals and assumptions of authority.

Your Lordship states, furthermore that in reply to my "23 pages of personalities and insinuations," you referred to the previous friendly relations existing between yourself and the other members of the Council of Public Instruction. I never intimated or imagined that those relations were otherwise than friendly and Christian ; but your Lordship's letter referred to, (dated 1st May,) contains other avowals and assumptions for which I know of no precedent in the history of Canadian Correspondence and to which I replied in my letter of the 12th. I am aware that the "good spirit of our Council of Public Instruction is far from being prevalent in certain localities" of the country ; but I am happy to know that such "localities" are comparatively few, since, notwithstanding the counsels to make vigorous efforts to establish and multiply Separate Schools, the number of such Schools is one-third less according to the returns of this year, than they were according to the returns of last year ; and for such "localities," yearly diminishing in number, the operation of the Separate School Clause of the law may still be invoked.

Treatment of Catholics not to be affected by the Bishop's conduct.

I have only to add, that notwithstanding the course pursued, and the language employed, by your Lordship in regard to me, I shall still endeavour, as heretofore, to treat my Roman Catholic fellow subjects as kindly and cordially as those of any other religious persuasion in the country ; and the more so, as I am satisfied the example and spirit of the lamented Bishop Power are still widely cherished by the Roman Catholics in Upper Canada ; as well as the testimony borne by myself and the Council of Public Instruction, and numerous others, not members of the Roman Catholic Church, to the virtues and patriotism of that excellent man.

I have the honor, &c.

(Signed,)

E. RYERSON.

The Right Rev. Dr. DeCharbonnel,
Roman Catholic Bishop of Toronto.

Spirit of previous action in regard to Separate Schools.

P. S.—Nor should I omit to remind your Lordship, that the provision of the law in regard to Separate Schools, as amended by the short bill of 1851, (the draft of which was prepared by myself in the presence of your Lordship, and that of the very Reverend Vicar General McDonell) was approved of by your Lordship. My printed Corres-

pondence on the law in 1849, (s) my official Circulars printed in 1850, (t) in connection with my recent letters to your Lordship, show, that no change has taken place in my interpretation, views, or administration of the law ; but that the course now pursued by your Lordship has arisen from the adoption, on your part, of a new policy, and the avowal of new sentiments and objects.

(Signed,)

E. R.

(s) "I cannot depart from what I have stated and illustrated at large in my '*Report on a System of Public Elementary Instruction for Upper Canada*,' printed by order of the Legislative Assembly in 1846, under the head of Bible and Religious Instruction in Schools, [pages 22-52] where, while I have held up to reprobation merely sectarian instruction in the schools, I have shown the extent to which the Holy Scriptures are used, and religious instruction given, in the non-sectarian mixed schools of different Christian countries—Protestant and Roman Catholic. On this vital question, I am happy to be sustained by the authority and example of the Irish National Board.... I have not assumed it to be the duty, or even constitutional right, of the Government to compel anything in respect either to religious books or religious instruction ; but to *recommend* the local Trustees to do so, and to *provide powers and facilities* to enable them to comply with that recommendation within the wise restriction imposed by law. I have respected the rights and scruples of the Roman Catholic, as well as those of the Protestant, although, by some, I have been accused of having too friendly a feeling towards the Roman Catholics. It affords me pleasure to record the fact—and the circumstance shows the ease and fairness with which I have acted on the subject—that before adopting the section in the printed Forms and Regulations on the '*Constitution and Government of the Schools in respect to Religious Instruction*,' I submitted it to the late Roman Catholic Bishop Power, who, after examining it, said he would not object to it, as Roman Catholics were fully protected in their rights and views, and as he did not wish to interfere with Protestants in the fullest exercise of their rights and views."—*Correspondence on the School Law in 1849*, page 53.

(t) "The provision of the 19th Section, as far as it relates to separate Protestant and Roman Catholic Schools, is substantially the same as that contained in the 55th and 56th sections of the School Act of 1843 and in the 32nd and 33rd sections of the School Act of 1846, with the exception that the present Act imposes more effective restrictions and conditions in the establishment of such schools than either of the former Acts referred to. Under the city and town school Act of 1847, the establishment of separate schools in cities and towns was at the discretion of the Municipalities, and not at that of the applicant parties. No complaint having been made against this provision of the law, even in cities and towns, it was at first proposed to extend the application of the same principle and provision to Township Municipalities ; but objections having been made to it by some (both Protestant and Roman Catholic) Members of the Legislature, the provision of the former school act was re-enacted—requiring however, the petition of twelve heads of families, instead of ten inhabitants, as a condition of establishing a separate school ; and aiding it upon the principle of average attendance, instead of at the discretion of the Local Superintendent, as under the former Acts. But notwithstanding the existence of this provision of the law since 1843, there were last year but 31 separate schools in all Upper Canada—nearly as many of them being Protestant as Roman Catholic ; so that this provision of the law is seldom acted upon, except in extreme cases, and is of little consequence for good or for evil—the law providing effectual protection against interference with the religious opinions and wishes of parents and guardians of all classes, and there being no probability that separate schools will be more injurious in time to come than they have been in time past. It is also to be observed, that a separate school is entitled to no aid beyond a certain portion of the school fund for the salary of the teacher. The school house must be provided, furnished, warmed, books procured, &c., by the persons petitioning for the separate school. Nor are the patrons and supporters of a separate school exempted from any of the local assessments or rates for Common School purposes. The law provides equal protection for all classes and denominations ; if there be any class or classes of either Protestants or Roman Catholics who are not satisfied with the equal protection secured to them by law in mixed schools, but wish to have a school subservient to sectional religious purposes, they should of course, contribute in proportion, and not tax a whole community for the support of sectarian interests."—*Chief Superintendent's Circular to Township Councils*, dated 12th August, 1850.

"It may be proper for me to make an explanatory remark on the 19th section of the School Act, authorizing, under certain circumstances, the establishment of Protestant or Roman Catholic Separate Schools. In my late Circular to Township Councils, I have remarked upon this provision of the Act, and shown that it is no new provision, but one which has existed up-

No. 11.—Dr. Ryerson's Circular to Municipalities, on the Clergy Reserves.*

SIR,—By the late settlement of the Clergy Reserve question, a considerable sum of money is placed at the disposal of each Municipality in Upper Canada; and I take the liberty of addressing to you, and to the Council over which you have been chosen to preside, a few words on the expenditure of the money which the Act of the Legislature has placed under your control.

Advantages of appropriating the Reserves to Education.

I beg, therefore, to submit to your favourable consideration, whether the highest interests of your Municipality will not be best consulted by the application of the whole, or at least a part of that sum, for procuring Maps, Charts, Globes, &c., for your Schools, and Books of useful and entertaining reading for all classes and ages in your municipality. If you apply the money to general purposes, it will amount to comparatively little, and the relief or advantages of it will scarcely be perceived or felt. If you apply it to the payment of the salaries of Teachers, it may lessen for the present the amount of your Municipal School rates; but it will add nothing to your educational resources, and will be of momentary advantage. But if you apply it to furnish your Schools with Maps, Globes, &c., and your constituents with Libraries, you will not only confer a benefit which will be felt in future years, in all your schools, by all your children, and all classes of your population, and that without imposing a six pence rate upon any one, but will double your resources for these most important purposes. The Legislative School Grant is apportioned to each municipality *according to population*, and is not, therefore, increased or lessened by any application you may make of your share of the Clergy Reserve Fund. But the Legislative Grant for School Apparatus and Public Libraries is apportioned to each municipality *according to the amount provided in such municipality for the same purposes*. In applying your Clergy Reserve money, therefore, to these purposes, you *double the amount of it*; and confer upon the rising generation and the whole community, advantages which will be gratefully felt in all time to come, and develope intellectual resources, which,

wards of seven years—since the commencement of our present Common School system. It has clearly been intended from the beginning as a protection of the minority against any oppressive or invidious proceedings on the part of the majority in any school division, in addition to the ordinary provision of the Act, prohibiting the compulsory attendance of any child upon a religious exercise, or reading a religious book, to which his parents or guardians shall object. The existence of so few separate schools (only about 31 in all Upper Canada, and nearly one-half of them Protestant) shows that the provision for their establishment is rarely acted upon,—as the local school authorities seldom find occasion for it. And as there can be no separate school in a school division, unless the teacher of the mixed school is of a different religious persuasion from the applicants for such separate school, the local Board of Trustees can always, if they think proper to do so, make such a selection of teachers as will prevent the establishment or continuance of separate schools.”—*Chief Superintendent's Circular to Boards of School Trustees, dated 7th October, 1850.*

* We call attention to an able letter or circular in our columns to-day from Dr. Ryerson on the subject of the Clergy Reserves. The question is clearly and forcibly stated; and, without intending, at present, to add anything in regard to the importance of furnishing each school division with a library and philosophical apparatus, whose value, in years to come, cannot be estimated, we may add our testimony to Dr. Ryerson's that it was the intention of the best men, who advocated the secularization of the Reserves, to have them so applied, and that even the very worst were willing to gain secular knowledge by the re-investment of the Church property in the Government. As the Municipalities are left to their own action in the premises, it is more than probable that Dr. Ryerson's suggestions will be very generally, if not universally, acted upon.—*Colonist.*

in their turn, will tell powerfully upon the advancement of the country in knowledge, wealth, and happiness.

Examples of some Municipalities.

Some Municipalities have anticipated what I now venture to suggest, by resolving to apply their share of the Clergy Reserve Funds to the purposes above mentioned. The first application I received was from a comparatively new and poor Township, whose share of the Fund in question amounted to £200; the whole of which the Council nobly determined to apply for procuring maps for the Schools and public Libraries for the Township, and sent a Deputation to Toronto to select the books, maps, &c. I had great pleasure in adding other £200 to their appropriation; and thus every School in the Township is furnished with maps and other requisites of instruction, and every family with books for reading, and that without a farthing's tax upon any inhabitant. It is delightful to think of a Township whose schools are thus furnished with the best aids to make them attractive and efficient, and whose families are thus provided (especially during the long winter evenings) with the society of the greatest, and best, and most entertaining men (through their works) of all countries and ages! Several Towns, Villages, and other Township Municipalities have adopted a similar course, some of them appropriating larger sums than that which I have mentioned.

The People of Upper Canada have been long in favor of it.

The voice of the people of Upper Canada has long been lifted up in favor of appropriating the proceeds of the sales of the Clergy Reserves to educational purposes. Now that those proceeds are placed in their own hands through their municipal representatives, it is as consistent as it is patriotic to carry out their often avowed wishes; and I know of no way in which it can be done so effectually as that, by which the amount of it may in the first place, be doubled, and in the second place, be so applied as to secure permanent benefit to every pupil and every family in each Municipality in Upper Canada. If the principal of the Fund were invested, and the interest accruing therefrom be annually applied, as I have taken the liberty to suggest, then ample means would be provided for supplying in all future time every School and every family in Upper Canada with the means of increasing the interest and usefulness of the one, and the intelligence and enjoyment of the other, to an indefinite extent, and that without even being under the necessity of levying a rate or imposing a tax for that purpose. Such an investment would be the proudest monument of the intelligence and large-heartedness of the grown-up population, and confer benefits beyond conception upon the rising and future generations of the country.

I have, heretofore, furnished each Municipal Council with a copy of the Catalogue of Books for Public Libraries, and I herewith transmit a copy of the Catalogue of Maps and other school Apparatus provided by this Department, together with the printed blank forms of application; and I shall be happy to afford every aid and facility in my power, as well as make the apportionments above intimated, towards accomplishing an object, or rather objects, so noble in themselves, and so varied and permanent in their influence and advantages.

I will thank you to have the goodness to lay this Circular before your Municipal Council, and let me know as early as convenient the decision of your Council on the subject which I have taken the liberty to bring under your notice, in order that I may know what apportionments and provisions may be requisite to meet the appropriations, and comply with the wishes of the various Municipalities.

I have the honor to be,

Your fellow-laborer, and faithful servant,

E. RYERSON.

EDUCATION OFFICE,
Toronto, 15th Nov., 1856.

No. 12.—Mr. Bruyere to the Conductors of the Press in Canada :

Mr. Bruyere wants to be famous.

GENTLEMEN,—I have before me a "Circular" addressed by Dr. Ryerson Chief Superintendent of Schools in Upper Canada, to the heads of City Town, Township, and Village Municipalities, in this section of the Province, on the appropriation of the Clergy Reserve Funds. In this letter the distinguished head of the Educational Department, takes upon himself to deliver a lecture to the Municipalities of the upper section of the Province, on the expenditure of the money accruing from the secularized Clergy Reserves. The Rev. gentleman *submits to the favorable consideration of the Municipalities, whether their highest interests will not be best consulted by the application of the whole or at least a part of the sum, for procuring maps charts, globes, etc., etc., for their schools, and books of useful, entertaining reading for all classes and ages in their Municipality.*

Mr. Bruyere does not approve of such Submission.

On the propriety of thus intruding an unasked advice on our various Municipalities, I will not attempt to express an opinion. (u) The worthy Doctor may be actuated by considerations which may plead as an excuse for his meddling interference in the concerns of others.

Mr. Bruyere introduces himself to the Municipalities with a compliment.

I may be permitted, however, to say, *en passant*, that our Municipal bodies being composed of citizens of the highest respectability by their moral character, education and standing in society, should be the best and sole judges of the most suitable appropriation of the money which the Act of the Legislature has placed under their control. Had the Rev. gentleman allowed our Municipalities to follow, in this, their own judgment and discretion, I would have considered it imperative, on my part, an humble Priest of the Catholic Church, to remain silent. Having now before me the example of the distinguished Chief Superintendent of Schools in Upper Canada, I may be permitted to venture to suggest some considerations on the same subject. (v)

Doubtful of the settlement of the Reserves being High-handed Robbery.

Our Legislators, in settling two years ago, that long-pending and much vexed question of the Clergy Reserves, meant to withdraw from the

(u) Like Bishop Charbonnel, it is evident that Mr. Bruyere has not lived long enough in Canada to study the school law, or former practice of our public officers.

(v) Cool logic, certainly, after his previous remarks. But, then, he is the model controversialist and reasoner of the *Leader*!

private use of one portion of our community funds which they considered should be applied to general purposes, and to the benefit of all, Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, Catholics, as well as members of the Church of England. They designed to share amongst the whole community, the immense resources which were to accrue from the sale of landed estate heretofore enjoyed by a small class of her Majesty's subjects, the clergy of the Church of England. They proposed to themselves to remove forever from our midst, a fruitful source of discord and bitter dissension. Whether the Act of the Provincial Parliament should be looked upon as a measure of distributive justice, or an act of high-handed robbery I am not prepared to express an opinion. Bearing this in mind, I may be permitted to ask, whether it is right and proper now to appropriate to one portion (*w*) of our people funds which the Legislature intended for the general use and benefit of all citizens, without distinction of creed or nationality.

Mr. Bruyere beholds Palace-like Structures and enquires about them.

I beg leave, in turn, to submit to the favorable consideration of the public, whether the end of the Legislature will be obtained by the application of the proceeds of the sale of the Clergy Reserves to the purposes mentioned by Dr. Ryerson, viz., to the furnishing Common Schools with maps, globes, and other school apparatus—public libraries? Pray what are these educational institutions which Dr. Ryerson proposes to endow with the proceeds of the Clergy Reserve fund? We look around, and behold huge and palace-like fabrics, stigmatized by public opinion as godless schools. (*x*) What are these stately edifices, rearing up their proud turrets over the breadth and length of the land? What are these gigantic mansions which first meet the eye of the traveller on entering our city? Let the truth be proclaimed again for the hundredth time. They are Common Schools, built with Catholic as well as Protestant money. (*y*) They are houses of education from which religion is banished, where the elements of Christianity cannot be inculcated to the rising youth, where the child of Christian parents must be taught practically that all religious systems are equally pleasing, or rather equally indifferent in the sight of God, be he a believer in the immutable decrees of eternal reprobation or a follower of the impostor Joe Smith. These halls of learning already so richly supplied with the most elegant school apparatus, are shut up against one-third, or, at least, one-fourth of the population of Upper Canada. (*z*) Yes, a Catholic parent, who values his faith above all worldly advantages, and who rightly considers religion as the basis of all education, and the life of man upon earth, would rather doom his child to the horrors of the most degrading ignorance, than permit him to drink in the common Schools the poison of infidelity or heresy along with the pure draught of useful knowledge. These convictions are likewise shared by a large portion of the members of the church of England. Talk not to us of your superior training, splendid school apparatus, and highly qualified teachers. If these advantages, great as they may be are to be purchased at the price of our faith, we value

(*w*) "One portion!" Mr. B. speaks as if Canadian Catholics were of one mind with him. But see hereafter.

(*x*) Only by the "foreign element," who don't understand our institutions.

(*y*) And intended for, and used by the people of those names, as Mr. B. admits.

(*z*) "I am able to assert that, with a few honorable exceptions, these sound Roman Catholics educated in mixed schools, are Catholics in name, Protestants or half-heathen in practice."—*Mr. Bruyere's admission*. That is—they won't support the "convictions" of the "foreign ecclesiastics;" and therefore it is "meddling interference" for Mr. Bruyere to speak.

them not; we do not want them; we spurn them; and fling them back into your face. (a)

Foreign element does not like the laws of Canada.

Sad would be the alternative left to the Catholic population of the Province, were Dr. Ryerson to have his own way. To send our children to the Common Schools, we cannot, without risking their faith, which we esteem above the most brilliant education, tainted with infidelity. To withhold them is to deprive them of the immense advantages held out in these richly endowed halls of learning, which the acute Chief Superintendent so earnestly recommends to the liberal patronage of our Municipalities. We read of the tyranny of a Julian, the apostate, condemning the Christians of his days to ignorance and degradation, by shutting up their schools, and forbidding them to attend the halls of learning. History records the penal laws enacted in Ireland, making it felony for the adherents of the ancient faith either to harbor a schoolmaster in their houses or to send their children abroad to be educated in a country whose faith was more congenial to their own. I do not hesitate in saying, that the yoke attempted to be imposed on our neck by the Chief Superintendent of Schools in Upper Canada, is not a little less galling, less insufferable, than that of the apostate Emperor of Constantinople, or of the Protestant rulers of England. He will, if allowed to have his own way, crush and annihilate our poorly endowed, and poorly furnished Separate Schools, by the overwhelming superiority of his school apparatus, and by the already enormous resources placed under his control. But should the bait of the tempter entice the Catholic child to the godless schools, we will have nothing to envy the neighbouring republic. There, thanks to the State education, now in its zenith, an infidel generation is rising up every where. "The serpents of irreligion," says a distinguished writer of New York, "swarm everywhere. They are to be found in the halls of justice and even in the temples consecrated to religion. Over twelve millions of infidels are scattered through that once flourishing republic,—now the land of Know-Nothingism, riot, and blood shed. Behold the lamentable fruits of all system of education encouraged and patronised by Dr. Ryerson, once a Minister of the Gospel! Having these facts, and the insidious "Circular" before me, I do not hesitate to assert, that the Chief Superintendent of Schools in Upper Canada is the most unrelenting and most oppressive enemy of Catholicity in this section of the Province, throwing altogether in the shade the apostate Julian of old? (b)

Why foreign views are not carried out?

If Dr. Ryerson was sincere in his anxiety for the diffusion of useful knowledge among the rising generation, without distinction of creed or nationality, why does he not submit to the favorable consideration of the Municipalities, the propriety of applying, at least, a small part of the Clergy Reserve Fund to the use of Catholic Separate Schools? They too, and more by far, than Common Schools, stand in the greatest need of maps, charts, globes and other school apparatus. We are met, at once, by the liberal and learned gentleman saying: The law is in your way; there is a clause in the law for the secularization of the Clergy Reserves preclud-

(a) Well, then, don't mind them. The "few Separatists should go on in peace," since they choose to solate themselves, like the Mormons in Utah.

(b) The "Model Controversialist." Vide *Leader*.

ing expressly Separate Schools from any share in the distribution of these funds. Yes, indeed, the law is in our way, thanks again to the Superintendent of Education in Upper Canada, who, (if I am correctly informed,) suggested the aggressive clause cutting off Catholic Separate Schools from any share in the distribution of the above mentioned resources. If one system of education was to be excluded from any share in the common boon, why were not Common Schools hindered in like manner from deriving any benefit from these enormous funds arising from the secularized Clergy Reserves? Oh! no: Common Schools must be furnished, and abundantly furnished with maps, charts, globes, &c., &c. Let the benighted Catholic boy and Catholic girl learn astronomy by looking up to the stars, and geography by taking an easy trip around the world. (f)

Mr. Bruyere is profoundly inquisitive, and hopes he will be excused.

The next purpose to which the learned Superintendent calls the favorable consideration of the Municipalities, is the getting up of Public Libraries, by the purchase of books of useful and entertaining reading for all classes and ages in their respective districts. Here again, I must confess, the public at large, and Catholics especially, owe a deep debt of gratitude to Dr. Ryerson, for his amazing stretch of liberality. With due regard to the high standing and sacred character of the reverend gentleman, may I be permitted to ask him: What are those public libraries to be composed of? What class of authors penned these works of useful and entertaining reading? What sort of rare literary productions are to enter into the composition of these Public Libraries, made up under the superintendence of the learned Divine of the Methodist Church? What books will occupy the most prominent place in these well-furnished Libraries? Dr. Ryerson must excuse my anxious inquisitiveness.(g) Catholics are rather suspicious when they hear of a Protestant contrivance got up by Protestant agency, and under Protestant influence. The worthy Chief Superintendent is, or was, a Reverend Protestant Minister. He knows that the generality of Protestants read none but Protestant books, Protestant newspapers. In getting up his Libraries, he will consult his own taste and that of his readers; he must procure such books as will suit their predilection, books thoroughly impregnated with Protestant spirit. Now, such reading, entertaining as it may be to a Protestant mind, will never accord with our rather fastidious Catholic taste.

Mr. Bruyere thinks Dr. Ryerson has certain books.

But let us, for a moment take a rapid survey of those Public Libraries, got up under the superintendence of Dr. Ryerson. In looking over their shelves, it is not unlikely but my eyes will fall upon some of the most rabid anti-Christian writers, such as the infidel Hume, and the sceptical Gibbon. The next works which probably will meet my gaze, are such truthful historical books as D'Aubigny's History of the Reformation, whose assertions would put his satanic majesty to the blush. Will the Rt. Rev. Dr. Spalding's brilliant refutation of D'Aubigny's History find a corner in Dr. Ryerson's Libraries? No. The Rev. gentleman knows that his fellow-believers are generally satisfied with an *ex parte* view of the

(f) The Catholic laity of Canada have no objection to Mr. Bruyere doing the latter: "take an easy trip out of Canada."

(g) Doubtless; since these four inquisitive sentences indicate profound iteration.

subject. Then comes the richly got up diaries of distinguished Protestant tourists, giving to the world their fanciful sketches, from notes hastily taken from the window of a vehicle, (b) on Italy, Naples, Spain, and other benighted Catholic countries, sitting in the shadow of ignorance, vice, superstition and idolatry. A Catholic clergyman has lately favored us with his admirable outlines on France, Italy, Naples, &c. But these masterly historical sketches, by the Rev. Mr. Haskins, being the production of a Popish Priest, will find no room in Dr. Ryerson's Public Libraries. A more prejudiced or more illiberal work than White's elements of General History, could not be conceived. This historical compendium, replète with the vilest insults against what Catholic nations venerate and respect, was, and is, probably, still taught in the Grammar Schools. Of course such a book will be quite welcome in the Public Libraries.

What a liberal Protestant, prompted by doubts, would look in vain for.

A liberal Protestant, prompted, perhaps, by serious doubts and misgivings, and desirous of reading the other side, will look in vain in those public libraries, for Hawkins' travels through France, Italy, &c.; Bossuet's Variations; Balmes' Protestantism and Catholicity compared; Chateaubriand's Genius of Christianity; Cardinal Wiseman's Lectures; Doctor Newman's Lectures; the End of Controversy, by Dr. Milner; Audin's History of Luther, Calvin, Henry VIII., Leo X.; Count de le Maistre's works; Trials of a mind, by Doctor Ives; Religion and Society, by Abbe Martinet; Dr. Spaulding's Lectures; Cobbett's Reformation; Lingard's Anglo-Saxon Church; Gahan's Church History; Travels of an Irish gentleman in search of a religion, History of the Church, by Reeve; Trev-ern's Amicable Discussions; and sundry other works which assist a Protestant Reader in forming a correct opinion of the respective merits of Protestantism and Catholicity. The above named works, and such others as are written by impartial and well-informed authors, are not, as a general rule, to be found in those public libraries so much eulogised by Dr. Ryerson. Instead of them, you meet there with nothing but the flimsy productions of narrow-minded and prejudiced writers, who give you a distorted and one-sided view of the subject they treat, if it has any reference to Catholicity, Catholic nations, and Catholic morals or customs. (c.)

Foreign element disapproves "suggestion" of useful and entertaining reading.

From the above statement and the perusal of the worthy Chief Superintendent's "Circular," the public cannot be at a loss to discover his benevolent designs. The learned Doctor *ventures to suggest* to our various Municipalities, the application of, at least, a part of their share of the Clergy Reserve funds, to the purchasing of works ludicrously styled by him, *books of useful and entertaining reading*. The Chief Superintendent of schools, whose cranium has been stretched to its utmost capacity, cannot find out a better use of public money, destined for general purposes, than to purchase with it, and place into the hands of rising generations, both Catholics and Protestants, *books of useful and entertaining reading*: viz: books calculated to corrupt the budding mind of youth with the venom of infidelity, revile catholicity, insult the ministers of a church of two

(b) So they are not accustomed to use such "half heathenish" things as railroads there! Another evidence that he is not long out from the foreign country.

(c) Bishop Charbonnel acted as one of the selectors, and is understood to have attended meetings where the whole business was approved.

hundred millions of human beings, misrepresent their doctrines and practices. In these *books of useful and entertaining reading* the most sacred tenets of our Holy Religion are attacked with a virulence and bitterness worthy of a Julian the apostate. There Catholicity is exhibited in a most odious form ; then this phantom, the offspring of a heated imagination, or perhaps of a malicious heart, is assailed with the most violent abuse, it is attacked with the powerful arms of ridicule and low ribaldry. In these works, recommended by Dr. Ryerson, *books of useful and entertaining reading*, the morals, character, customs, and condition of Catholic countries, are depicted by ignorant or prejudiced scribblers, who are about as competent to write on Catholic nations, and Catholic usages, as a New Zealander who would attempt to give a correct narrative of the manners and customs of England, which he has never seen or heard of. (d) In some of the books which are to make up our public libraries, for the use of the rising youth of Upper Canada, religious subjects are handled with the most amazing confidence by audacious tyros as inadequate to the task they have undertaken, as the blind man who sets himself up as a lecturer upon colors, or one deaf and dumb who ventures to give his views on the theory of sound.

Foreign Ecclesiastical View of Canadian Libraries.

In a word, to foster an anti-christian spirit, hatred and animosity, to sow the seeds of dissension and religious discord among the citizens of the same community ; such are the detestable purposes to which Dr. Ryerson would have our Municipalities to apply part of the money which the Act of the Legislature has placed under their control. Let those who relish these *books of useful and entertaining reading* purchase them with their own money. But, in the name of justice and common sense, let not public money and public funds, destined for general purposes, be squandered away in increasing the power of a contrivance already productive of so much mischief.

But the "foreign element" thinks *it* has a right to advise the Municipalities.

I conclude with expressing a sincere hope that the good sense, honesty and liberality of our Municipalities in Upper Canada will defeat the snares of the enemy of peace and good feeling in this section of the Province, by applying the funds placed into their hands to general purposes and to the common use of all, Catholics as well as Protestants, since they are all members of the same community, and have an equal right to its resources. (h) Let these resources with which a kind Providence has blessed us be spent in improving our Cities, Towns and Villages, in draining and macadamizing our streets, digging sewers where wanted, in founding institutions of general beneficence, such as common baths for the use of poor people, in establishing general dispensaries, where the sick of the poor class may procure whatever medicine may be necessary, in securing in each Ward of our large cities the services of one or two Physicians who would attend the most urgent cases of destitution. Let a part of the Clergy Reserve Funds be employed in erecting shelters for the aged, the infirm, the widow, the orphan, and the immigrant. Many of our Houses of Industry are in a lamentable state. In several Towns, and even Cities, the destitute and poor

(d) Or, perhaps, a better simile: as Mr. Bruyere to write on Canadian Schools and Canadian Catholic views.

(h) Of course the unofficial Mr. Bruyere is not an "interfering meddler !!"

are yet without shelter. When the famishing widow will appeal to your sympathy will you reach her a *Globe* to appease her hunger? When the half-naked orphan will stand before you will you give him a map to cover his shivering limbs? When the anxious immigrant will reach your shores will you receive him with a chart to rest his wearied body upon? When sickness and pestilence breaks out in your midst will you be able to relieve suffering humanity by scattering around you books of useful and entertaining reading, such as Dr. Ryerson suggests to purchase with the money placed under your control.

And says his advice is better than Dr. Ryerson's.

Let me now, with due respect, put the question to the benevolent members of our Municipality: Will they be able to answer the numerous calls of humanity, to relieve so many sufferings, to provide for so many wants without large funds, and especially without increasing our taxes, which are already enormous? Let me then hope that the heads of our cities and towns will take better advice than that offered them by the Chief Superintendent of Schools. Let each municipality, therefore, follow, in the use of their respective share of the Clergy Reserve Funds, their own judgment and discretion) without permitting themselves to be dictated to by the head of the Educational Department. Our worthy Chief Superintendent sees but one thing—his schools; he thinks of nothing but his schools. During the day all his thoughts are taken up with his schools. In the silence of the night the success and prosperity of his schools interrupt his peace and slumbers, and rise up before his vision. (i) Are the fathers of our cities and towns, the heads of our municipalities, to make themselves ridiculous because Doctor Ryerson chooses to be so? Are they to waste and squander away public money intended for general purposes because the dictator of the schools bids them do so? No: our people expect better things from those to whose keeping they have confided their welfare. They hope that they will be actuated but by one consideration,—the general good and utility of all; influenced but by one motive,—love and good-will towards all.

In conclusion, I beg leave to state that I will consider it as a favour if the Press in Toronto and elsewhere do me the honour of inserting in their columns the above views, imperfect as they are. The subject is of the utmost importance and should be placed before the public. On the conductors of a wise press devolves the duty of enlightening public opinion. To the good sense and kind indulgence of the public I submit these considerations, and beg to subscribe myself

Their humble servant,
J. M. BRUYERE.

(i) And, pray, for what else was he appointed, but to promote the success and prosperity of the Schools of Upper Canada? The "ridiculousness" is attributed to the foreigner, who claims the right to dictate to our public bodies, and intrude upon the inherent rights of the subject.

No 13.—Dr. Ryerson's first reply to the Rev. J. M. Bruyere.

EDUCATION OFFICE,

Toronto, 22nd December, 1856.

When I first read in the *Leader* of the 10th inst., the letter of the Rev. J. M. Bruyere (Roman Catholic Priest in this city) addressed to the "conductors of the Press in Canada," criticising a circular which I recently addressed to heads of Municipalities on the application of the Clergy Reserve Fund, and assailing our Common School system generally, I thought his statements were too improbable and his objections too often refuted to require any notice from me. But I find by remarks in the *Leader* and other papers, as well as by observations in private circles, that I am expected to reply to this anti-public school champion; and I am induced to comply with wishes thus entertained, chiefly by the considerations that Mr. Bruyere appears as the representative and organ of a party and that the statements of his letter afford me another opportunity of exhibiting the fair and generous principles of our public school system, and of exposing the unfairness and baselessness of the objections urged against it by the party of Mr. Bruyere. (*j*)

Personalities—a favorite weapon.

2. The personalities of Mr. Bruyere manifest the favorite weapon of his party in all controversies, and require little notice. (*k*) When a law of the land requires the Chief Superintendent of education, among other things, "to employ all lawful means in his power to promote the establishment of school libraries for general reading," "provide the school with maps and apparatus," and "to collect and diffuse useful information on the subject of education generally," Mr. Bruyere shews as little regard for law as for good taste, in charging me with indecent presumption and intrusion, in submitting to the Municipal Councils the suggestions contained in my circular, and more especially when I proposed to add "to each municipal appropriation, one hundred per cent.," out of grants which the liberality of the Legislature had placed at my disposal for the very purposes of establishing public libraries and providing schools with maps and apparatus. But with as little consistency as logic, Mr. Bruyere denounces my example in intruding upon the public on the subject of education, and yet pleads that, very example for his doing the same thing! (*l*)

Mr. Bruyere's compliments to the Municipalities.

3. Mr. Bruyere remarks that our Municipal bodies being composed of citizens of the highest respectability by their moral character, their education, and standing in society, should be the best and sole judges of the most suitable appropriation of the money which the Act of the Legislature has placed under their control." I quite agree in this extorted tribute to the intelligence and patriotism of our Municipal Councils; and it is on this very ground that I have proposed from time to time the provisions of laws to invest them with such large and responsible powers in regard to the education of the youth of the country. I am glad that the

(*j*) The "party" however, seems to include the foreign ecclesiastics, and "a few" Canadian Catholics according to Mr. B.

(*k*) Their rule, perhaps, is *Jette, jette de la boue quelquechose y restra*.

(*l*) 'Tis rather a novel feature to see a foreigner interfere between a provincial officer and the public bodies he is appointed to deal with. Wonder would that be allowed in the country from which Bishop Charbonnel and Mr. Bruyere have come?

party of Mr. Bruyere has at length learned to appreciate the Municipal bodies more highly than recently, when they declared them too ignorant and bigotted to determine the boundaries of separate school sections, or appoint superintendents to divide the school moneys between the separate and public schools. On account of these clamours, the division of school moneys between the public and separate schools was transferred from the Municipal authorities to the Chief Superintendent, and the separate school Act takes away the determining of the boundaries of separate school sections from the Municipal Councils altogether—making the boundaries of a separate school section within the limits of which the separate school is established; whereas formerly the Municipal Councils, in compliance with the wishes of supporters of separate schools, often extended the limits of separate school sections over three or four common school sections. It appears now that Mr. Bruyere's party begins to think more favorably of Municipal bodies than heretofore; and those bodies will doubtless appreciate his compliments. (*m*)

What are his protests?

4. The professed subject of Mr. Bruyere's letter is a two-fold protest—one against the application of any part of the Clergy Reserve Fund for the purchase of school maps and apparatus; the other against its application for the purchase of public libraries. I will examine the grounds on which he professes to base each of these protests.

Separate and Public Schools equally supplied with apparatus.

5. He protests against any part of the Clergy Reserve Fund being applied to the purchase of school maps and apparatus, because the Separate Schools are excluded from any participation in it for that purpose.—He says: "The Catholic Separate Schools too, and more by far than the Common Schools, stand in the greatest need of Maps, Charts, Globes, and other School apparatus. We are at once met by the liberal and learned gentleman saying: the law is in your own way; there is a clause in the law for the secularization of the Clergy Reserves, precluding expressly Separate Schools from any share in the distribution of these funds." Mr. Bruyere proceeds to charge me with having suggested this clause of the law for the secularization of the Clergy Reserves, and then piteously exclaims: "Common Schools must be furnished abundantly with Maps, Charts, Globes, &c., &c. Let the benighted Catholic boy, and Catholic girl, learn astronomy by looking up to the stars, and geography by taking an easy trip round the world." Now, the simple fact is, that I not only never suggested one clause, phrase or word of the law for the secularization of the Clergy Reserves, but there is no restrictive clause whatever, such as Mr. Bruyere asserts, though municipalities in Lower Canada are precluded by an Act passed last session from raising anything for the support of dissentient Schools.⁽ⁿ⁾ The Separate Schools in Upper Canada have precisely the same facilities for providing themselves with Maps, Charts, Globes, &c., as the Common Schools; and supporters of Separate Schools in Toronto, Kingston, Hamilton, London, Chatham, Brantford, Niagara, Barrie, Peterboro', Prescott, and other places, have

(*m*) Bishop Charbonnel, no later than 1855, denounced these Municipalities as the great opponents to the extension of his Separate Schools. Others of his foreign clergy have done the same. His Grand Vicar, however, now thinks them perfect paragons of liberality.

(*n*) "After the 1st July, 1856, the Trustees of dissentient schools shall *alone* have the right of fixing and collecting the assessments to be levied on the inhabitants so dissentient."—*Lr. Canada School Act of 1856*.

availed themselves of the facilities of procuring Maps, Charts, Globes, &c., at this department, and to each of them I have apportioned one hundred per cent. on the sums advanced by them. And only a few days before Mr. Bruyere makes these assertions, the Roman Catholic Bishop of London was shewn the depository of Maps, Globes, &c., by myself, and he ordered a number of them for his Separate Schools, and to which I made the apportionment of one hundred per cent. on the amount advanced.

Libraries supplied to the Townships are non-Sectarian.

6. Mr. Bruyere's statement in regard to books in the official catalogue for Public Libraries are equally unfounded and contrary to fact. While he exclaims against the histories of "infidel Hume and the sceptical Gibbon," he ought to know that neither of these works is in the "Index Expurgatorius," while Archbishop Whately's *Logic*, and Macaulay's *History* are thus distinguished. He says "D'Aubigné's *History of the Reformation*," is in the catalogue, which is not the fact. He says there is no such book in the catalogue as "Cardinal Wiseman's *Lectures*,"—whereas "Cardinal Wiseman's *Lectures on the connection between Science and Revealed Religion*" are on the official catalogue, and also Bossuet's *Universal History*. Mr. Bruyere likewise says, "In vain will we look in these public libraries for Lingard's *Anglo-Saxon Church*; Gahan's *Church History*; *History of the Church* by Reeve," when each of these three histories is contained in the official catalogue; as also Lingard's *History of England*; Mylius' *History of England*; Fredet's *Ancient History*, and Fredet's *Modern History*.

Bishop Charbonnel himself selected Catholic Works.

These works were inserted in the catalogue three years ago on the recommendation of Bishop Charbonnel, to whom was communicated the wish of the Council of Public Instruction that he would select the Roman Catholic histories he judged best, as the Council, on the disputed ground of civil and ecclesiastical history, intended to select a certain number of standard works on each—leaving it to what Mr. Bruyere himself calls the "good sense, honesty, and liberality of the Municipalities in Upper Canada," to procure which they might please; and most of them have made a fair selection of histories from both sides. (c)

Cardinal Wiseman was also consulted.

Nay, when in London in 1851, making selections of library books for examination, and arrangements for procuring them, I had (on the strength of a letter of introduction from a high quarter) an interview with Cardinal Wiseman, to whom I briefly explained the principles on which I proposed to promote the establishment of Public School Libraries in Upper Canada—the avoidance of doctrinal and controversial works of any religious persuasion, as between Protestants and Roman Catholics, and the selection of the best popular works in all the departments of human knowledge, and I wished his Eminence to favour me with a list of books and their publishers such as were approved by his church and in harmony with the character and objects of the proposed Canadian Libraries. Cardinal Wiseman frankly replied, that nearly all the books printed and sold by Catholic publishers, were doctrinal expositions and vindications of the

(c) Unfortunately for Mr. Bruyere, he knew nothing of the circumstances, as he was not here at the time.

Catholic Church, or such as related to questions between Catholics and Protestants, and therefore, not adapted to the non-controversial and non-denominational libraries I proposed to establish. Yet, after this, I applied to Bishop Charbonnel, notwithstanding his previous attacks on me, and inserted in the catalogue every historical library book recommended by him, and more than the histories enumerated by Mr. Bruyere. Thus, throughout, have I pursued a fair, a kind and generous course towards Roman Catholics, and have treated them with a consideration which has not been shown to any Protestant denomination, while their Charbonnels and Bruyeres have not ceased to requite me with evil for good by their ceaseless misrepresentations, provocations and calumnies.

Refutation of Calumnies against the system were in Mr. Bruyere's possession.

7. Mr. Bruyere represents me as the most inveterate enemy of Romanism in the country, and employing every means in my power to oppose and destroy it. What may be my views as to the peculiar doctrines of Romanism and Protestantism, and of the comparative influence of each system upon religion, morals, intellect, social order, liberty, civilization and man's well being here and hereafter, is a matter which appertains to myself. I am responsible for my *official* acts; and to them I appeal for a refutation of Mr. Bruyere's imputations. And the reader will, perhaps, be surprised to learn, that at the very moment Mr. Bruyere thus assailed my official conduct, he had fresh recollection, if not in his possession, a practical refutation of his own charges, as I had, no longer ago than the 25th of November, addressed to him an official letter, (in reply to one from him,) every sentiment and word of which disproves his statements. (*p*) As this correspondence illustrates the religious aspect of our Common School system, the extent to which Mr. Bruyere and his friends seek to avail themselves of it, and the fairness and "liberality" with which I have interpreted and applied the law in favour of Roman Catholics as well as Protestants, I append copies of it to this letter for publication, as the best answer to the attacks of Mr. Bruyere's party. This correspondence is only a specimen of much of the same kind. I select it because it has recently taken place with Mr. Bruyere himself. A man's necessities must be great and his scruples small indeed, when he conceals the truth and asserts the contrary.

Books on general knowledge unsectarian.

8. In conclusion, I beg to add three or four general remarks. The first is, that Mr. Bruyere's objections to the system of providing the schools with maps, &c., and the municipalities with libraries, are perfectly frivolous and groundless, as in regard to these the Separate Schools and the Roman Catholics are placed upon precisely the same footing as the Public Schools and the other classes of the population. (*q*) The books which Mr. Bruyere complains of as selected for the libraries are not in the catalogue of all, and the histories which he represents as having been omitted are all in the catalogue, while the culture of the vast and varied field of human knowledge—common alike to the Romanist and Protestant—is provided for by the best

(*p*) According to late accounts, his correspondent is reported to "view the domineering spirit of some of the French Jesuit Priests with disgust."

(*q*) "On application, I will furnish your Separate Schools with maps, apparatus, and libraries, upon the same terms as the Public Schools;—that is, I will add one hundred per cent. to whatever sum or sums you may forward."—*Circular to Separate Schools*, June, 1855.

translations of the famed authors of ancient Greece and Rome, by the best works on every branch of natural history, science and philosophy, every department of human industry and enterprise, as also of genius, imagination and taste; and from this extensive catalogue of some four thousand different works (several thousand volumes) selections are made at the uncontrolled discretion of those whom Mr. Bruyere himself has pronounced "citizens of the highest respectability by their moral character, education, and standing in society."

Religion not banished from the Common School.

My second remark is, Mr. Bruyere's statements and objections, that religion is banished from common schools and that they are infidel, are equally groundless and untrue, as may be seen by the appended correspondence, the official regulations, and hundreds of official returns. The only ecclesiastical in Canada that ever proposed the "banishment of religion from our common schools" was Bishop Charbonnel himself. In his official correspondence with me, (printed by order of the Legislative Assembly,) letter dated 1st of May, 1852, the Bishop says—"I have said, that if the catechism were sufficiently taught in the family or by the pastor, so rare in this large Diocese—and if the mixed schools were exclusively for secular instruction, and without danger to our Catholics, in regard to morals, books and companions, the Catholic Hierarchy might tolerate it, as I have done in certain localities, after having made due enquiry." I am quite aware of the object of thus wishing to banish all recognition of religion from our common schools, as well as Mr. Bruyere's object in asserting that such is now the fact. The same course was pursued by Bishop Hughes and his partizans in the city of New York some time since. Under the pretence of not permitting anything denominational in the schools, the Bible was taken out of the hands of the Protestant pupils, and every paragraph and sentence, and every word in which any reference to religion or even the Divine Being was made in the school books, was crossed or blotted out. I have in my possession a specimen of this system of school book emasculation in order to conciliate (as it was supposed) Bishop Hughes and his followers.

The success which followed its banishment in New York.

Did it succeed? Certainly not. The schools having been thus rendered so objectionable to large classes of Protestants, it was thought they might be crushed altogether. Bishop Hughes now denounced them, as Mr. Bruyere does our common schools, as godless, infidel, &c., and to be shunned by all mankind as the deadly fountains of infidelity. I have endeavoured to guard our school system and schools from a similar danger by equally protecting the rights and interests of both Protestant and Romanist; and this is the real ground of the alarm and denunciations of Mr. Bruyere and his coterie, who class all as infidels that are not of their party, and all teaching as infidelity which is not given under their direction. I will not consent to Mr. Bruyere's wresting from the hand of a Protestant child his Bible—the best charter of his civil liberty, as well as his best directory to heaven—any more than I will force it into the hands of the Roman Catholic child or wrest from him his Catechism. Thus are the assertions of Mr. Bruyere and his *confreres* falsified, and their alien aggressions against our common school system defeated.

The ultramontane movement a recent one.

In the days of the venerable Bishop McDonell and the excellent Bishop Power, there was no such clamour against our common schools; though they were liable to greater objections from that quarter than now; there were then no such classification and denunciation of all as infidels who do not believe in the peculiar dogmas of the Church of Rome—no such efforts to separate Roman Catholics and their children from Protestants; and the result was, there were as sound Roman Catholics then as now, and the Roman Catholic children who were taught in the mixed schools are as good Roman Catholics as those who have been, or are taught in the Separate Schools; there were from six to twelve Roman Catholics, members of the less numerous Legislative Assembly of Upper Canada, elected by the common suffrages of Protestant as well as Roman Catholic electors, instead of one, as at the present time, and he elected by protesting against Separate Schools and against priestly influence. (r)

Catholicism injured by the Foreign Priests.

Ten *Globes* and their contributors could not do as much to impair the influence of the Roman Catholic Church, and blight the hopes of its members in regard to such distinctions and advantages as depend on the popular elective voice, as have the Charbonnells and Bruyeres of that Church during the last five years. Though one may not regret this as a Protestant, yet every benevolent and patriotic mind must lament that there is any class of children or citizens in the country so isolated as to deprive them of the mental development and culture enjoyed by others, and cut off from the prospects of all public offices and distinctions depending upon the elective voice of the people, to which intelligence, talent, industry and worth are justly entitled, irrespective of religion, sect or creed. It is to the Charbonnells and the Bruyeres the infusion of a new foreign element (s) into our country since the days of Bishops McDonell and Power—that our Roman Catholic fellow citizens owe the cloudy civil and social prospects that are darkening the future of themselves and their children.

The School House the property of all and intended for all.

The palace-like school-houses richly furnished with appropriate maps, charts and other apparatus, which inflict such pangs in the heart of Mr. Bruyere, are so many voluntary creations of the people themselves; so many bright illustrations of a glorious progress, in which Catholics, in common with all other classes, should, and may equally participate. (t) I should falsify the whole of my past life, and despise myself, were I not scrupulous to protect the rights and feelings of Roman Catholics equally with those of any, or all other classes of the community. It is certain of their own ecclesiastics, who have inflicted upon them burdens and disadvantages which their fathers had not to bear in the days of Bishops McDonell and Power; who have made that a mortal sin at a municipal

(r) Mr. Mackenzie says of them:—"No man was more anxious than the writer of this article, to see that excellent man, Col. Chisholm (father of the Rev. J. J. Chisholm, of Lindsay), elected for Glengarry, over Mr. McMartin a Presbyterian. The busy, meddling priests of his Church have driven our people from trusting any of their [Roman Catholic] faith."

(s) Aye, the "foreign element."—that's the sore point, and Mr. Bruyere knows it; and that nothing is more distasteful to the Catholic laity of English, Irish, Scotch, or Canadian birth, than the influence or spread of that same "element,"—foreign to them in speech, habits, and education. Yet they are threatened with more of it, by Bishop Charbonnel's present efforts in France to collect and send out foreign priests from that country.

(t) And so they do; otherwise why do they not obey the mandates and pastorals to establish Separate Schools?

or school election, which was formerly no sin at all; who deny the ordinances for attending schools, an attendance at which was formerly encouraged when those schools were more exceptionable than at present.

Scruples about Common Schools lately manufactured to order.

The conscientious convictions of which Mr. Bruyere talks, have been manufactured to order, as also the mortal sins which are charged upon certain Catholics. (u) The authors of such violations of the rights of both God and man: who treat the immortal minds of Roman Catholics just as the American slave-holder does the mortal bodies of his slaves; who prohibit all mental development, all exercise of thought, all participation of any mental food, the reception of even a single ray of intellectual light, except at their own command, and under their own manipulation; the authors of such an enslavement and extinction of all that is expansive and dignified and noble in man are alone responsible, if the Roman Catholics and their descendants in Upper Canada become "hewers of wood and drawers of water" to other classes of their fellow citizens, instead of standing on equal footing with them and rivalling them in intelligence, mental power, enterprise, wealth, individual influence and public position.

A new despotism in the State over the State, and its inconsistencies.

But the authors of this new crusade for the creation of a despotism in the State, and above the State, upon the wrecks of Canadian intellect and civilization, seem reckless of principles as of consequences; and to destroy our national school system every variety of method is employed. At one time, all state provision for education is denounced, and that in the face of state endowments for education in Lower Canada; at another time it is insisted not only that the state, but that even the municipalities shall collect and provide funds for the support of Roman Catholic schools, as may be demanded from time to time by their supporters, and that without any supervision or accountability such as is required in regard to public schools equally open to all classes of the community. (v) At one time members of the Government and of the Legislature are thanked and praised for having passed certain provisions of a Separate School law;—at another time the very same persons are denounced from the same source for not having repealed those provisions. The assertion that our schools are infidel is an insult and libel upon the people of Upper Canada, who cherish and support them; and the pretence is as idle as groundless, that the pupil of a day school cannot be taught his catechism at all unless taught it during the six hours per day of the five days and a-half of each week that he is in the school, when he is sixteen hours each week-day and the whole of Sunday under the care of his parents and priest.

But I have in my last annual report sufficiently vindicated the religious and impartial character of our school system. I need not do so again in this place; my present object is only to defend it and myself against the fresh attacks of Mr. Bruyere, and to expose the spirit and character of his semi-official manifesto.

(u) The "conscientious convictions" were never discovered as existing in Upper Canada until 1852; nor on the Continent until after the Encyclical Letter of the previous year or two. The "mortal sins" are later—they appeared in Leut, 1856.

(v) Bishop Charbonnel, in 1854, complained that Separate Schools could not avail themselves of the Municipal Assessment and Collecting, and yet under the present law, Mr. Bruyere acknowledges the receipt of "city taxes."

The ultra-Montanists anti-British.

My last remark is that the same spirit which assails, misrepresents and calumniates our school system, is equally hostile and calumnious against everything British, from the throne down to the school municipality. You cannot open the journals in which the letters of Bishop Charbonnel and Mr. Bruyere find an echo without seeing them largely devoted to selections and articles assailing the British Government as the most unjust and execrable in existence, both in its foreign diplomacy and domestic administration, and the British nation as the most heartless and unprincipled on the face of the globe. Were I to insert only those passages of this kind that I have marked, the reader would be surprised and shocked at the concentration of enmity which is cherished and inculcated by these journals against the Government, character, institutions, and prosperity of the mother country. Their hostility to our system of public instruction is only one aspect or phase of a crusade against everything that places Great Britain at the head of modern civilization, and makes her the asylum and guardian of liberty for the oppressed of all nations, and develops her national mind and resources beyond those of any other country in Europe.

I trust the papers that have inserted his attacks will insert this reply.

E. RYERSON.

Correspondence between Dr. Ryerson and the Rev. J. M. Bruyere on religious exercises and religious instruction in the Common Schools—[referred to in the preceding.]

No. 1. *The Rev. J. M. Bruyere to the Chief Superintendent of Education.*

(L. R. 4882, 1856.)

ST. MICHAEL'S PALACE, Oct. 23rd, 56.

RESPECTED SIR,—The inclosed letter reached me yesterday. Unable to solve the question proposed to me, I take the liberty of addressing it to you, as the most competent judge in such a matter. Should you be so kind as to give your opinion on the involved question, I will forward it to Mr. Bulmer.

Hoping you will forgive the liberty I have thus taken in trespassing on your valuable time.

I am, Dear Sir, your most obedient Servant,

(Signed)

J. M. BRUYERE.

Dr. RYERSON,

Chief Superintendent of Education.

Enclosure.]

WINDSOR, Canada West,
21st Oct. 1856.

The Rev. J. BRUYERE.

DEAR REV. SIR,—I hope you will excuse the liberty I have taken in writing to you on a legal point of law, but as many parties here cannot give and even differ on the involved question, I thought probably you could obtain me the solution and advice I seek far better in Toronto, when so near the Board of Education, than what I could in Windsor. The point to which I refer is as regards the school tax of this section. I am Teacher and Collector of School Sections Nos. 2 and 5, township of Anderdon,

County of Essex. Being in want of money, the Trustees empowered me to collect the school tax as authorised by law, but when calling on two or three Protestants, they protest against the tax, and say it is a Catholic school.

1. The school is free and supported by general tax.

2. All the people with three exceptions are French, and require the Christian Brothers' 2nd Book to used for their children, while the Protestants use what books they think proper.

3. Catholic prayers are used at the recommendation of myself and Trustees, both at morning, noon, and evening prayers.

4. I have taught the French Catechism to the Catholics when the confirmation was held at Malden during school hours, but only to the French children.

5. No religious knowledge has been taught to the three Protestant children, and only a Christian Brothers' book, 2nd series was given to one of them, when the boy brought me 2s. to buy one for him.

The questions involved here are: Have we, by teaching catechism to the Catholic children during the school hours, and by using the Christian Brothers' books for Catholic children, exempted the Protestants from tax, and made the school separate instead of common or public?

This is the only school in the section, and the Protestants have not demanded another, since all the children, with three exceptions are Catholics, and speak French. We have only used the French books, with the exception when a boy or class wished to learn English; then and only then have we used the English translation.

We have closed school on days of observance by the Trustees' order, but the Protestants object to it, and say they will bring an action against us for violating the law, as only certain holidays are allowed by law.

Your early reply will greatly oblige, as I am forced to seize the goods and chattels of persons making default of payment after ten days notice; which has nearly expired for all the Protestants.

I am, dear and Rev. Sir, your ob't servant,

(Signed)

THOS. L. BULMER,
Teacher, Windsor.

P. S.—I teach school six miles from Malden, but receive my letters in Windsor, as my general residence is there.

T. L. B.

No. 2. *The Chief Superintendent to the Local Superintendent of Anderdon.*

EDUCATION OFFICE,
Toronto, 27th Oct., 1856.

[No. 2649 S.]

SIR,—I will thank you to return the enclosed letter at your earliest convenience, with such remarks and explanations (on a separate sheet) as you may judge necessary.

I have the honor, &c.,

(Signed)

E. RYERSON.

Joseph R. Berthelot, Esq.,

Local Superintendent, Anderdon, Amherstburgh.

No. 3. *The Local Superintendent of Anderdon to the Chief Superintendent.*

ANDERDON TOWNSHIP,
County of Essex, C. W.

[L. R. 5046, 1856.]

[Not dated. Received E. D. 14th Nov., 1856.]

SIR,—My being absent from home will account for this delay in the answer of yours of the 28th ult., No. 2649—requesting I should return the enclosed with such remarks and any explanations I may judge necessary.

I would inform you that in my great desire to start or establish a good and large school in sections Nos. 2 and 5, which had been so sorrowfully neglected that I felt it necessary and justified under the circumstances in granting to Trustees and Teachers certain privileges which may be considered in some degree a violation of the law, regulating Common Schools. The children being all small, and all French except two; parents wishing they should be taught French for the first year at least, if not the second; there being no translation of the books authorized, I permitted them to use such books as are used in the Township of Sandwich and Lower Canada. As regards the teaching of Catechism to the children, it was understood to be out of school, in other words after school hours. I knew that if I did not allow a slight violation of the law, the section would be without a school, now consisting of 30 to 40 pupils. I would here remark that the two or three Protestants whom Mr. Bulmer the teacher speaks of, are perfectly justified in protesting against the tax imposed by trustees:—not knowing the circumstances under which I acted. When explained to them, which I will do in a few days, they, I feel assured, will justify the slight violation, and pay the school tax willingly, and more, if it is deemed necessary to keep the school in its present condition. I feel well assured that the strict adherence to the letter of the law by the *last* Superintendent was the cause of so small a number of children attending school. I am *also* fully satisfied from what has transpired, that a slight deviation in nothing very essential does remove objections which parents frequently urge as an excuse for not sending their children to school. It is a true and melancholy fact that in this and adjoining Township the majority are constantly urging reasons for not sending their children, and it is only by a personal visit of the Superintendent, and not always successful, to every head of a family, to urge; and I might almost say *beg* of them to send their children, you are enabled to form anything like a good school. I have thought it advisable to state a few facts, to give you some idea of the difficulties attending the duties of a Superintendent who feels as he should about schools; they must palliate any slight deviation from his duties which are clearly pointed out. I have no doubt but what the Trustees have done some little things that might be taken advantage of, but I have every reason to think that they have acted honestly and thought it lawful and right. Should it be thought best and proper to make a change in the management of the school sections Nos. 2 and 5, after the reasons here given for my allowing certain privileges, I would ask for advice and instructions.

Yours respectfully,

(Signed) JOSEPH R BERTHELOT,
Local Superintendent in Anderdon Township.

No. 4. *The Chief Superintendent to the Rev. J. M. Bruyere.*

EDUCATION OFFICE,

Toronto, 25th November, 1856

SIR, —In reference to your letter of the 23rd ult., the receipt of which I acknowledged on the 27th ult., I have received from the Local Superintendent of Anderdon (Mr. J. R. Berthelot,) his explanation relative to the matters referred to in the letter of the Trustees of School Sections Nos. 2 and 5 in that Township, which you had enclosed to me, and on which you request my interpretation of the school law.

1. The law in Upper Canada does not permit any authority whatever to interfere between the parent or guardian and child in regard to religious instruction. The law on the subject of using books and giving religious instruction in the public schools in as follows:—"No foreign books in the English branches of education shall be used in any model or common schools without the express permission of the Council of Public Instruction, nor shall any pupil in any such school be required to read or study in or from any religious book, or join in any exercise of devotion or religion which shall be objected to by his parents or guardian; provided always, that within this limitation pupils shall be allowed to receive such religious instructions as their parents or guardians shall desire, according to the general regulations provided according to law."—(School Act of 1850, section 14.)

On this section of the Act the Council of Public Instruction have founded the following remarks and regulations: "In the section of the Act thus quoted the principle of religious instruction in the schools is thus recognized. The restriction within which it is to be given is stated, and the exclusive right of each parent and guardian on the subject is secured without any interposition from Trustees, Superintendent, or the Government itself; therefore it shall be a matter of mutual, voluntary arrangement between the teacher, and the parent or guardian of each pupil, as to whether he shall hear such pupil recite from the catechism or other summary of religious doctrine and duty, of the persuasion of each parent or guardian.

In regard to devotional exercises, the Council of Public Instruction, after recommending that the daily exercises of each common school shall be opened and closed by devotional exercises, remark that "the Lord's prayer alone, or the forms of prayer hereto annexed may be used, or any other prayers preferred by the Trustees and Teacher of each common school."

According to the above quoted provisions of the Act and the regulations founded upon it, you will perceive that the restriction as to the use of foreign books in the schools does not apply to any published in the French, or in any other than the English language; that the Trustees, Teacher and parents of the pupils of the schools referred to by you, can exercise their own discretion, as to the prayers and books of religious instruction, and the religious instruction given to the pupils of the school, so as not to compel the Protestant children to be present at them against the wish of their parents or guardians, or lessen the amount of secular instruction to which they are entitled in the school.

I have the honor, &c.,

(Signed,)

E. RYERSON.

The Rev. J. M. BRUYERE,

(In re Nos. 2 and 5 Anderdon.)

No. 14.—Rev. J. M. Bruyere's Rejoinder to Dr. Ryerson.

*To the Conductors of the Press in Canada.*The Model Letter—vide *Leader*.

The long expected reply of the Chief Superintendent of Education, at length made its appearance in *The Leader* of the 24th ult. The perusal of it has brought back to the recollection of many, the old adage of the Latin poet:

Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus

Mus.

which I translate freely, thus :

Dr. Ryerson, after several weeks of painful labor, has brought forth a ridiculous
—Fuss. (n)

The Rev. gentleman starts off with a sarcasm upon what he chooses to call the *extravagance and puerility* of the Rev. Mr. Bruyere's letter. It I am not mistaken, an impartial public is naturally inclined to look over with indulgence the occasional *puerilities* which may escape an earnest and honest man. But I doubt whether they will extend the same indulgence to the crudities thrown broadcast in the face of *two hundred millions* of believers in the Church of Rome. Pause awhile, reader. The creed of Catholics is termed by Dr. Ryerson "*conscientious convictions manufactured to order.*" No one better than the Chief Superintendent of Education knew the falsehood of a charge which, besides, is the most outrageous insult offered to Catholics, as rational beings and believers in a creed which is professed by the greatest geniuses as well as the most limited capacities. This creed *manufactured to order* was believed by the conquerors of Poitiers, Cressy, and Agincourt, by Bossuet, Fenelon, Massillon, Descartes, Mallebranche, Tasso, Napoleon. It is professed by such weak-minded men, as Cardinal Wiseman, and Archbishop Hughes. Many of the most gigantic intellects and profound reasoners of the present day have made their profession of this creed, fit only for brutes, according to Dr. Ryerson: The Schlegels, the Stotbergs, the Hellers, the Hurters, the Newmans, the Brownsons, the Mannings and the Wilberforces. It is daily embraced by Dukes, Duchesses, Peers, men of the highest nobility, resplendent with learning and virtue. Over five hundred ministers of different denominations, have, during the last ten years, made their solemn profession of those *conscientious convictions manufactured to order.* (o)

Mr. Bruyere thanks the "independent and noble" *Leader*.

I thank most sincerely the independent and noble Editor of *The Leader*, who, in his editorial remarks of the 24th ult., flung a manly rebuke in the face of the reviler of the faith of his fellow-christians. (p)

(n) The reader will be kind enough to bear in mind, that the "patron" of the Canadian press recommends this production as possessing, throughout, a "marked dignity" of style, quite in accordance with that of the *Leader*! Let him not be astonished at an occasional scurrilousness—that only shows a vigorous writer; nor at an oath!—that,—perhaps,—was accidental—"unintentional," in fact.

(o) This initial letter is appropriate to such a paragraph. Mr. Bruyere well knew, when he penned the above, that it was not the belief of Catholics which was referred to; but the "convictions" against schools which he and his co-foreigners have manufactured and thrust upon Canadian Catholics since 1852.

(p) "The rejoinder of Father Bruyere to Dr. Ryerson will be found in our columns to-day; and in several respects is more than a match for the official. His style and tone certainly contrast most favourably with those of Dr. Ryerson."—*Leader*. "The truth is that Bruyere having described the editor of the *Leader* as "noble and independent," and that "noble and independent" person not knowing whether he was on his head or his heels after receiving such a compliment to his "deportment," incontinently formed himself with Bruyere into a "mutual admiration society."—*Globe*.

Mr. Bruyere hurt by the Epithet of Foreigner.

Doctor Ryerson, in order to prevent public indignation from falling heavily upon his godless system of education, endeavors to depict me as *the representative and organ of a party*—a small and inconsiderable party, doubtless, leagued for the destruction of State Schoolism. With a view of bringing upon my devoted head an overwhelming weight of odium, he attempts to draw a line of distinction between the native clergy and the foreign clergy, between those of former days and those lately entered into the ministry in this Province. Alluding to me personally, and to his Lordship Dr. de Charbonnel, now in Europe, he bestows upon us the old epithet borrowed from the *Globe*, his new organ,—of foreign clergy, *the infusion of a new foreign element*, unacquainted, of course, with our Canadian Institutions and usages. (p) The hypocrite son of John Wesley, condescends to speak in terms of praise of *the venerable Bishop McDonnell and the excellent Bishop Power*, insinuating as clearly as language can convey his meaning, that the saintly Bishops above named were rather favorable to State Schoolism. In their days, if we are to believe Dr. Ryerson, *there was no such clamor against our Common Schools*.

The Injurious Imputation and unhappy Example.

Now, as to the injurious imputation which the Chief Superintendent of Education has tried to fasten upon the character of the late lamented Bishop Power, I am happy in being able to scatter it to the four winds. I have before me a letter addressed last March, to the Editor of the *Colonist* in this City, by the Honorable John Elmsley, of Toronto. I beg leave to lay before Dr. Ryerson and those it may concern, the following extracts from the documents alluded to. Addressing the Editor of the *Colonist*, the Honorable Mr. Elmsley says: "Following the unhappy example of Dr. Ryerson, and indeed almost using his words, you have thought proper to allege that Bishop Power understood the working of the Public School System, and died contented. As to the first portion of this allegation, I am in a position to state that Bishop Power was certainly not long in coming to a perfect understanding of the workings of that infidel system to that latter portion, that he died contended therewith. I am equally competent to state, and do hereby declare, that it is totally void of truth. His Lordship did me the honor to confide to my charge a large share in the working of the Catholic Separate School System, from the moment that he understood the workings of the other, or mixed system, until it pleased Almighty God to call him to the enjoyment of his reward in Heaven. In favor of Catholic Schools he devoted his best energies; and were he now living, he would set himself vigorously to the work of counteracting the effects of those educational establishments which practically ignore the dogmas of the Christian Religion, and are rapidly subsiding into pure deism * * * * Your encomiums, in so far as they relate to the line of conduct you have attributed to him, are severe reproaches; and I am most happy in having it in my power to state, for the benefit of all whom it may concern, that our late Bishop was a most energetic advocate and supporter of Catholic Separate Schools, and most resolutely opposed to mixed.

"I have the honour to be, Sir, Your obedient servant,

"J. ELMSLEY."

(p) And so they are. Ask Canadian Catholic laymen, and they will tell you so.

Commentary on the above document is unnecessary. The Honorable Mr. Elmsley is as well known in this city as Dr. Ryerson. For honesty, candor, and character, the former stands, at least, on an equality with the latter. From the persual of Mr. Elmsley's letter, the public may judge what faith is to be placed in the Chief Superintendent's insinuation, that Bishop Power was favorable to mixed education, or State Schoolism. (q)

Knows nothing of Bishop McDonell.

As to the *Venerable* Bishop McDonell, as Dr. Ryerson affects to call him in his new-fangled veneration for a Catholic Prelate, I know nothing of his dispositions concerning Mixed or Separate Schools. This good man had gone to the enjoyment of his reward in Heaven long before my coming into this Province. But from the bare-faced imputation cast upon Bishop Power's character by the Chief Superintendent of Education, I may safely infer, that the Venerable Bishop of Kingston was about as much in love with the working and fruit of the Common School System, as the present incumbent of the Catholic See of Toronto.

Some Canadian Catholics may have supported the Schools

That the opposition to the State School System may not have been consequent upon its immediate introduction into the neighbouring Republic, as decided and universal as it is at the present time, may be readily accounted for. Many honest men, among whom were some Catholic Clergymen, in a spirit of conciliation, may have been willing to give it a trial. But as the tree is known by its fruits, this criterion has not been wanting to the Common School System. I have before me evidences of its deleterious results in the United States, which fall with crushing power upon its supporters and advocates. I will select a few of them, all taken from Protestant authorities, and from some of the leading American papers. The *New York Church Journal*, in an article headed "The Common School System a failure," says: "The Common School System is proving a disastrous failure. It has grown up on the pledges it has given of its ability to make crime less frequent, to confer greater security to life and property, and to give elevation to the tone of national morality. But it does not at all fulfil these promises. The whole system, we regret, is proving a lamentable failure." In the same article, my authority goes on saying: "The prevailing system is lamentably defective, in that it does not aim at the training of the whole man; neglecting, as it does, the moral and controlling powers of human nature, and concentrating all its force upon the development of the intellectual." Again, in the same article: "The prevalent notion that mankind are vicious because ignorant, and that to make them virtuous, it is only necessary to make them intelligent, is contradicted alike by sound philosophy and universal experience." Next follows a report of the Prison Association of New York, revealing a most alarming increase of crime, since the introduction of the Common School System into the country. The *Richmond Examiner*, another Protestant paper, has the following: "The worst of all these abominations, because when once installed, it becomes

(q) Facts, however, are stubborn things. Bishop Power proved his support of Mixed Schools, by acting as Chairman of their Provincial Board; and his opposition to this "foreign element," by strongly recommending the education of native teachers—British or Canadian born—for the Canadian National Schools.

the hot-bed propagator of all—is the modern system of free schools. We forget who it is that has charged and proved, that the New England system of free schools, has been the cause and prolific source of all the legions of terrible infidelities and treasons that have turned her cities into Sodoms and Gomorrachs, and her fair lands into the common nestling-place of howling bedlamites.” Lately the American papers filled their columns with a series of startling revelations as to the morals of the “Common Schools in Massachusetts.” These revelations, says a contemporary, are altogether too beastly for us to transfer to our columns. Suffice it to say, that they establish the fact, that the boasted “Common Schools” of our republican neighbors, especially the “girls’ school,” are—we do not say but little better, but—a good deal worse than the ordinary places of debauch which abound in large cities.”

Mr. Bruyere thinks that the Schools are imported—are a “Foreign Element.”

Were it necessary, I might extend my quotations to any desirable length. The above will suffice, I trust, to convince any sensible man, that Catholics have some reason for their hostility to State Schoolism, and their preference for free Separate Schools. The Common Schools presided over by Dr. Ryerson are but an importation from the New England States, where they have produced their disastrous effects. Our Common Schools are the worthy daughters of Yankee Land. There, contempt of all religion and its ministers, infidelity, know-nothingism, riot, and bloodshed, have kept pace with the progress and prosperity of State-Schoolism. Behold the precious inheritance which Dr. Ryerson is preparing to bequeath to Canada, should this deleterious education be forced upon us, and kept upon our necks, in spite of ourselves. Already the unhappy fruits of Dr. Ryerson’s schools are but too apparent in our midst. (r)

Mr. Bruyere acknowledges the results of Separate Schoolism.

I allude to the frequent instances of rudeness and ill-manners experienced by Clergymen of our Church at the hands of some of these juvenile Socrates, the pride of this Model Education. Hardly a week passes, but some Catholic Priest is insulted in some way or other by youths who are not educated in our schools. In mentioning the above incidents, I do not wish it to be understood that such rude and uncouth manners are tolerated, much less inculcated by the gentlemen of the Education Office. The Chief Superintendent and his amiable colleagues are the last men in the world, who would countenance such disgraceful acts. What I mean to say is, that such total disregard of Christian feeling and good manners, is the result of that system of education pursued in the Common Schools, viz: the absence of religious training. (s) To make an honest man, a Christian, a polished gentleman, something more is requisite than reading, writing, arithmetic, astronomy, natural history, &c. From the teaching of the declension of nouns, the variation of the article, and the conjugation of verbs, the child will never learn “to do

(r) Mr. Bruyere should have fully informed himself on the subject, before stating the above. The sources of our school system are as follows: From Archbishop Murray’s Irish School System we obtain all our school books, regulations in regard to religious instruction, and local inspection, and through the same source, the German element of Normal School Education. From the New England States, we take the principle that the schools should be supported by a tax on property. Which, then, influences the formation of the minds of children—the books the children read, or the tax their fathers pay?

unto others as he would have them do unto him." Let him master the rule of three, he will not, on that account, understand the distinction between *mine* and *thine*. Education, without religion, will never cure the vices and ill manners which are observable among the pupils of the Common Schools. Religion is the only antidote to crime. But, as all religion must necessarily be excluded from the "Common Schools" of a community whose members have no religion in common, it follows that the Common School System is inadequate to the object contemplated, viz: the preservation of society.

Says the Catholics don't like the Schools.

In presence of the above facts, which stare every sensible man in the face, who can refrain from smiling with pity at Dr. Ryerson's impudent assertion *that the people of Upper Canada cherish and support them* (the Common Schools,) when it is remembered that the whole Catholic population are dissatisfied with the working and sad fruits of State Education, and are calling for Free Schools? (*t*)—when you take into consideration that nearly all the members of the Church of England, and many of those in connection with the Church of Scotland, and the liberal and enlightened of all denominations, are opposed to them, and establish schools of their own, at the same time that they are made to support State Schools? At this very moment, Catholics are busily engaged in establishing and supporting their own Free Schools, notwithstanding the odious restrictions with which the Separate School Law is hampered. In pursuing this line of conduct, Catholics and other assertors of freedom of education, are guided by the unerring principles of eternal justice and equity. They claim, as a cotemporary says, the right and privilege to provide for the education as for the feeding and clothing of their children. They maintain that on parents, and not on the State, has the Creator of the universe imposed the obligation to provide for all the wants, corporal, intellectual, moral and religious, of their offspring. No power on earth can withdraw them from their control. The principle assumed by the Chief Superintendent of Education and the friends of State Schoolism, viz., that it is the duty of the State to provide for all the youth of the country, has been imported from pagan Lacedæmon. There, the infant was examined by the Magistrate; and if found feeble and deformed, and likely to be a burden to the State, it was doomed to immediate destruction. If strong, it was left to the mother's care till it had attained its seventh year. At that age, the child was entrusted to the public master, and his education was left to the wisdom of the law. I take the liberty of reminding Dr. Ryerson and his friends, that we are living in a Christian country, and blessed with the benign influence of a more humane Gospel than that of Lycurgus, the celebrated lawgiver of Sparta. To the parents, not to the State, the child belongs: so, at least, the law of God and of nature proclaims. From the parent's control no power on earth can snatch him. (*u*)

Further sample of the model style—Authorities quoted.

But because Catholics claim the privilege of educating their children, as they deem proper, and in their own schools, they are cried down

(*t*) "Free Schools" are the best description of our Canadian National Schools.

(*u*) This was the first and last time poor Mr. Bruyere dilated largely on the relative duties of the Church, the State, and the parent. See Dr. Ryerson's able and logical reply.

by Dr. Ryerson as the abettors of ignorance, as the future "*Hewers of wood, and drawers of water.*" Because, forsooth! they do not wish to be placed under the once shouting Methodist Preacher, they are represented by him as being *prohibited all mental development, all exercise of thought, all participation of any mental food, the reception of even a single ray of intellectual light.* If such be the unhappy influence of the Roman Catholic Church, over mental culture, intelligence and education, how gloomy must be the horizon of the capital of the Catholic world, the dread Rome! The following extract from an unexceptionable witness, because a Protestant and a Scotchman, will, perhaps, render my distinguished antagonist more diffident of himself, for the future, when he presumes to lecture on Catholic education. My authority is Dr. Laing, a well known Presbyterian Minister and a tourist, who relates what he himself saw and had full opportunity of examining. In his "*Notes of a Traveller,*" which appeared in 1844, he says:—"In Catholic Germany, in France, and even in Italy, the education of the common people in reading, writing, arithmetic, music, manners, and morals, is at least as generally diffused and as faithfully promoted by the clerical body as in Scotland. It is by their own advance, and not by keeping back the advance of the people, that the Popish priesthood of the present day seek to keep ahead of the intellectual progress of the community in Catholic land: and they might, perhaps, retort on our Presbyterian clergy, and ask if they too are, in their country, at the head of the intellectual movements of the age? Education is, in reality, not only not repressed, but is encouraged by the Popish Church, and it is a mighty instrument in its hands, and ably used. In every street in Rome, for instance, there are, at short distances, public primary schools for the education of the children of the lower and middle classes in the neighborhood. Rome, with a population of 158,678 souls, has *three hundred and seventy-two* primary schools, with four hundred and eighty-two teachers, and fourteen thousand children attending them. Has Edinburgh so many schools for the instruction of those classes? I doubt it. Berlin, with a population about double that of Rome, has only two hundred and sixty-four schools. Rome has also her University, with an average attendance of six hundred and sixty students: and the papal States, with a population of two and a half millions, contain seven Universities; Prussia, with a population of fourteen millions, has but seven." The reader will remark that the number of primary schools, in the city of Rome alone, is put down by Dr. Laing at *three hundred and seventy-two.* (v) This number is, perhaps, somewhat below the mark. According to the Roman Almanac for 1834, Rome then had three hundred and eighty-one free schools. This number has not likely decreased since, as the population has been steadily increasing. It must be recollected that many of these free schools are supported by private charity, whilst those of the Protestant countries are maintained only by burthensome taxation. The perusal of the above splendid testimony of Dr. Laing in behalf of Catholic education in Catholic Rome, will readily remind the reader of the well known proverb: "*Truth is powerful, and will prevail.*" The distinguished traveller can-

(v) Since Laing wrote, French and Austrian bayonets have been called into Rome, to preserve the life of its Sovereign; while Edinburgh has, time and again, loyally welcomed its and our noble Queen, and last year erected a colossal statue to her honor.

not be suspected of partiality to Catholic Rome. His prejudices and bigotry against it are only half concealed. Nothing but the power of truth could extort it. Dr. Ryerson, who seems to take special delight in expatiating *on all participation of any intellectual food* being prohibited to the followers of the Church of Rome, would do well to take a lesson of candor and honesty from his brother minister. His education, in this respect, I am sorry to say, must have been sadly deficient. His knowledge of Greek, Latin, Astronomy, or Botany, will never compensate before an impartial public, for the total absence of candor and sincerity.

The "Foreigner" tells Canadian Catholics what he thinks of them.

In spite of my anxiety to discover in Dr. Ryerson's long document, something sensible and truthful, I find myself altogether disappointed. Against his assertion that *the Roman Catholic children, who have been taught in the mixed schools, are as good Roman Catholics as those who have been, or are, taught in Separate Schools*, I beg to protest most emphatically. On the authority of the oldest and best informed Catholic Clergymen of Canada, I am able to assert, that with a few honorable exceptions, *these sound Roman Catholics*, educated in mixed schools, may be honorable men, honest men, according to the Protestant sense of the word; but, practical, religious, scrupulous observers of the rules of their church, they are not. They are Catholics in name; Protestant, or half-heathen, in practice. They are Protestant to all intents and purposes. Therefore we can well afford to give them up to the Chief Superintendent of Education in Upper Canada. They are as Catholic and as Protestant as himself. Behold the secret and great spring of the efforts put forth by Dr. Ryerson and his new organ, the *Globe*, to support Common Schools. Our enemies have sworn to destroy Catholicity in this Province. In their blind and inveterate hatred against it, they have not been able to contrive a more efficient plan than the Common Schools. Hence they move heaven and earth to uphold their tottering and crumbling machinery. (w)

Mr. Bruyere has found a Catalogue.

I come now to the examination of the charges brought against me, at the Supreme Court of the Education Office, in Upper Canada. I am charged with wilful error, in regard to certain exclusions as well as inclusions, in my list of books, which are likely to be admitted in, or excluded from, the public libraries. The Chief Superintendent of Education asserts that neither Hume nor Gibbon are to be found in his libraries. I repeat again, on the authority of my own eyes, that the above-named works are contained in the *Journal of Education* for 1853, under the head of "General Catalogue of Works for Public Libraries in Upper Canada." I will add, moreover, that lest the youthful reader should be tempted to shun these poisonous sources of scepticism and infidelity, to the titles of these dangerous books are appended notes well calculated to arouse curiosity in the mind of the reader, and entice him to take of the forbidden fruit. The history of the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, by E. Gibbon, is said in the catalogue prepared by Dr. Ryerson, to be a work which, "if it is not always history, is often something more than history;—it is philosophy, it is theology, it is wit

(w) Alas! for Canadian Catholics! To think of their not knowing the danger they were in, until a "foreign clergy" gave the note of warning!

and eloquence, it is criticism the most masterly on every subject with which literature can be connected." Of the *History of England*, by D. Hume, it is said in the note appended to it by Dr. Ryerson, "Though not impartial, nor free from religious scepticism, it is the most generally read History of England ever written. The author's philosophical turn of thought and beauty of diction together with his skill in arranging and grouping facts, invest his history with an interest that never flags." So much for the infidel Hume and sceptical Gibbon, *which are not in* Dr. Ryerson's libraries. If the Rev. gentleman has a catalogue of books different from the one under my eyes, let him publish it in some of our city papers, that the public may judge for themselves.

And finds therein certain Catholic Works, notwithstanding his former letter.

I have asserted that Bossuet's *History of the Variations* is not in the libraries got up by the Chief Superintendent. No allusion was made by me to Bossuet's *Discourse on Universal History*. Hereupon Dr. Ryerson takes me to task. I repeat the assertion. The reply of the Chief Superintendent is a miserable quibble, unworthy of an official. I repeat again, on the authority of the catalogue before me, Cardinal Wiseman's *Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church*, are not in the catalogue. I did not allude to Cardinal Wiseman's *Lectures on the Connection between Science and Revealed Religion*. The *History of England*, by Lingard, D.D., is in the catalogue, but with an appropriate note by the Chief Superintendent, warning his readers that "Doctor Lingard is a Catholic Priest, and an advocate of the Roman Catholic Church. (x) That is to say,—Beware, reader! it is the production of a Popish priest! Does Dr. Ryerson append such warning to books composed by Protestant writers, to put Catholics upon their guard? No! of course nothing unsound can come from a Protestant pen! I beg to assure the Chief Superintendent that the mistake about the *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, by Rev. Dr. Lingard; *History of the Christian Church*, by T. Reeve; and *Abstracts of the History of the Christian Church*, by Rev. W. Gahan, was quite unintentional on my part. (y) The reader, however, may judge of the importance attached by Dr. Ryerson to the unintentional exclusion of some two or three small volumes, where it is remembered that, out of over 4,000 works mentioned in the catalogue, perhaps not twenty works come from the pen of sound Catholic authors. So much for the fairness and honesty with which Dr. Ryerson boasts of having acted in the selection of books for public libraries!

"The infusion of a new foreign element into Canada."—How he likes it.

I stand accused, by the Chief Superintendent of Education, in his usual chaste and choice style, of being, together with his Lordship, Bishop de Charbonnel, "an infusion of a new foreign element into our country!" Query—If I am already infused, how can I be a foreign element? Has Dr. Ryerson, by some chemical process, separated the

(x) Perfectly correct, and in harmony with other notes which spoke of Hume's "religious scepticism," the "strong Protestant religious feeling" of the Religious Tract Society's History, the "splendid outline of ancient history" in Bossuet's Discourse; and the "well-arranged, carefully compiled, and agreeable histories" which Mr. Bruyere knows were written by Roman Catholics.

(y) And yet Mr. B. said, in his former letter, that he "looked in vain" for such works! And the "independent and noble" of the *Lewter* could not doubt him,—though he could the reply.

foreign from the native element? (z) Before I answer the charge, I beg to suggest to the Rev. gentleman of the Education Office, when he chooses to honor me again with his scurrilous diatribes, to let Dr. de Charbonnel alone. His lordship is now in Europe, consequently unable to repel the cowardly attacks of the Chief Superintendent of Education. I may be permitted, *en passant*, to inform his reverence, Dr. Ryerson, that Bishop de Charbonnel, with less means by far at his command than have been laid under the control of the Chief Superintendent, has done more for the cause of education in Canada, in five years, than Dr. Ryerson will ever be able to accomplish in twenty years, should the Almighty, for the punishment of our sins, inflict him on us during that space of time. To return to the very serious charge brought against me, viz., "of being an infusion of a new foreign element into this country," I do not hesitate in saying, that the accusation betrays an equal amount of ignorance of Catholic feelings and of malice. Had Dr. Ryerson lived in the days of the Apostles, he would, doubtless, have cried them down, as an importation from a foreign clime. These messengers of heavenly tidings, who carried the faith of Christ to the different nations, were not natives, says Archbishop Hughes, of the several countries in which they propagated Christianity. They were, by national origin, Jews: by the grace of divine faith they became Christians. In the eyes of the Catholic Church, there is neither foreigner nor native. Neither the Church nor its members should be called "a new foreign element" on any continent or island of this globe. In the Catholic Church, the Catholic of foreign birth stands on an equality with the Catholic of native origin. Under the influence of the Catholic or universal principle, representatives of all nations are blended together into a unity which has its foundation on the Eternal Wisdom, who came down from heaven to form a Church of all nations and of all peoples. Such is the doctrine inculcated almost in every page of that sacred book, which Catholics believe to be the Word of Eternal Truth. Dr. Ryerson may talk as long as he pleases about his nativism. It is but a mere accident, common to him with the insect of the bog and the fox of the forest. His boasted nativism is calculated to make him the laughing-stock of all sensible men.

Mr. Bruyere acknowledges how he is accused.

"Because an opponent of State Schoolism and an asserter of freedom of Education, I am accused by the Chief Superintendent of Education, of being an obstacle to the diffusion of *intelligence, mental power, enterprise, wealth, individual influence, and public position*. Now, hark, dear reader, to the real meaning of the Chief Superintendent of Education.

"The striking dignity of style."—*Vide Leader*.

His Reverence addresses you to this effect; "There is no intelligence except in my Hall of Science; no learning, except in my Schools. Everywhere else ignorance and degradation prevail. Your Christian Brothers, your Nuns, your Sisters of Charity, are all blockheads, stupid donkeys, compared with my teachers of the model Schools. You, my darling Municipalities, do not believe a word of what Rev. Mr. Bruyere tells you; he is a Popish priest. Give me a little more money; give me the

(z) No; they don't combine—just like oil and water. Mr. B. might shake them together in the bottle of "mortal sin," but when he lets them alone they won't mix.

whole Clergy Reserve fund. If you cannot give the whole, give me, at least, part of it. With this money I will rear throughout the breadth and length of the land, palace like schools, I will furnish them with the richest school apparatus; I will supply them with plenty of maps, globes, charts, etc., etc.; I will make them real rat-traps, holding out the most enticing baits. You, my dear little papists, come to my schools—my Model Schools. I will soon make you ashamed of your religion, and of your Church. Come, ye little papists.—You, Bishop DeCharbonnel, and you, Padre Bruyere; you are both scoundrels for opposing me in my noble efforts in behalf of my Model Schools; ye are the abettors of ignorance, the promoters of darkness, for keeping your little papists from coming under my parental care. I will soon make you feel the weight of my indignation, if you persist in your denunciation of my benevolent designs. By George! (a) I will destroy your Separate Schools, and send your Brothers and Nuns to Halifax, if you do not hold your tongue and stop your pen. Behold, reader, the real cause of the terrible roaring of the Lion of the Education Office.

Mr. Bruyere is not "the Organ of a party," but, "a feeble Echo."

Lastly, I am charged with being *the representative and organ of a party*. When Dr. Ryerson uttered this, he said what is untrue, and what he knew to be untrue. Unlike our neighbours, Catholics are not split up on any question of vital importance. On the question of education, as well as on any subject of equal weight, we are not divided into a thousand factions. No: we are united in one compact body, animated by the same feeling, guided by the same views. I avail myself of this opportunity to inform the worthy Superintendent of Education, that I am but a feeble echo of that mighty voice of 1,150,000 Roman Catholics, which, thunder-like, resounds from Sandwich to Gaspé, from the shores of our beautiful lake to the farthest northern boundaries. With one accord, one mind, pastors and people, demand *not* the abolition of Common Schools, as Dr. Ryerson would fain charge us with doing. We ask no favor, we ask our rights. We ask that we may be permitted to fulfil our duty towards our children, without tantalizing interference. Catholics ask to be let alone in the management of their free, independent and voluntary Schools. (b) They ask not to be compelled to send their children to houses of education against which they have conscientious objections. They ask that they be not taxed, and that the common funds of the country, viz.: the secularized reserves, be not devoted exclusively to the support of either church or school, to which, as Catholics, they have conscientious objections. They ask not to be compelled to contribute to the support of a system of education from which they can derive no benefit. With State Schools we will have nothing to do; we don't want them for ourselves. Let those who are satisfied with their working and fruits, enjoy them to their heart's content. Such is our position, such our principles. Will Dr. Ryerson see in them *alien aggressions against his Common School System*? Will he again charge us with an hostile intention against his Model Schools?

(a) Be-au-ti-ful! How the *Leader's* friend swears, and with such "marked dignity of style," as per *Leader's* certificate of same date!

(b) Yes! Canadian Catholics demand freedom from the tantalizing interference of "foreign priests:" freedom of enjoying theirs and their fellow citizens' schools—the National Schools of Canada.

A plain statement of facts and foreign advice.

From the above plain statement of our views and objects, the public may be able to judge of the amount of truth contained in the following senseless exclamation of the Chief Superintendent :—" *I will not consent to Mr. Bruyere's wresting from the hands of a Protestant child his Bible—the best chart of his civil liberty, as well as his best directory to heaven.*" Dr. Ryerson need not fear. Rev. Mr. Bruyere has never interfered with the conscientious belief of any one. Nor will he remain silent when the Chief Superintendent of Education, is holding the bait to entice the Catholic children into his schools, and exclaiming incessantly,—“Money, money; more money!” “Dr. Ryerson is a very expensive luxury,” says a contemporary. Therefore I have advised our Municipalities to withhold from him the Clergy Reserve funds.

Catholic teaching in Common Schools, and the “Chinese Rebellion.”

Before I conclude this already too long rejoinder, I beg leave to express my astonishment at Dr. Ryerson's dragging before the public, and without the consent of those concerned, his long correspondence between himself and some other persons. I believe that many will agree with me, when I say that it has about as much to do with the question at issue between Dr. Ryerson and myself, as the Chinese rebellion.

Mr. Bruyere on “Stays.”

The next suggestion I wish to make, is that desperate must be the cause which has to be propped up with such miserable stays as the *Globe*.(c) Dr. Ryerson's experience ought to have brought to his recollection, that every cause or measure advocated by such a wretched sheet, is doomed to fall. Were the prosperity of State Schoolism identified with the prosperity, religious feeling and wish of the people, the *Globe* would never have raised its impotent voice in its behalf.

Should it not be too late, I avail myself of this opportunity to offer to the worthy Chief Superintendent of Education, the compliments of the season.. That he may see many returns of the same, free however, from prejudices against his fellow Christians, is the earnest wish of his devoted friend and sincere admirer,

J. M. BRUYERE.

Toronto, Jan. 5, 1857.

P.S.—I hope Dr. Ryerson will excuse me if I have not answered his reply of the 24th ult. sooner. The Christmas Holidays, which are busy times for us, are the sole cause of the delay.

No. 15. Dr. Ryerson's Second Reply to the Rev. J. M. Bruyere.

The *Leader's* pattern of a controversial style.

In the *Leader* of Wednesday, the 7th instant, the Rev. J. M. Bruyere has addressed to the conductors of the Press in Canada, a second long letter against myself and the Common School System in Upper Canada. It is a professed rejoinder to my reply to his previous attacks; but instead of sustaining the positions he first assumed, and supporting the charges he first made, he virtually abandons every one of them, and occupies three

(c) Ah! but what of the *Leader*! Is there not an antithesis in the potency of its organic “stay?”

columns with miscellaneous declamation foreign to the subject, with pitiful misrepresentations of my words, and gross personalities, which accord so entirely with the tastes and feelings of the *Leader* as to be regarded by him as a pattern of controversial style. But as I have not thought it worth while to notice any of the many characteristic attacks which have been made upon me by the *Leader* during the last year or two, nor the previous personalities of Mr. Bruyere; so neither must I now suffer myself—however strong the temptation—to do more than show how completely the School System of Upper Canada, and its administration, stand vindicated against the insinuations of the *Leader*(*d*) and the attacks of Mr. Bruyere. With the *Leader* and Mr. Bruyere I may but merit the epithets of “falsehood,” and of being a “Hypocrite son of John Wesley;” but I leave it to the intelligent reader to suggest the grounds on which others than the *Leader* and Mr. Bruyere may regard me as entitled to the treatment of common decency, if not of gentlemanly courtesy.

Mr. Bruyere’s Charges—he abandons the first.

Mr. Bruyere’s first letter contained four principal charges. The *first* was, that Separate Schools were excluded from the provision which had been made for supplying the public schools with maps and apparatus—that Catholic children must learn geography by travelling round the world, and astronomy by looking up at the stars. In reply, I shewed that there was not only the same provision for supplying separate as public schools with maps and apparatus, but that many Separate Schools had been provided with them by me, and among others those in the City of Toronto itself. What does Mr. Bruyere now say in support of this grave and exciting charge? Not one word; and by thus abandoning it in silence, he tacitly confesses its utter groundlessness.

Restriction as to Clergy Reserve Moneys abandoned.

The *second* charge which Mr. Bruyere preferred was, that by a clause which he represented me to have got inserted in the Clergy Reserve Moneys Distribution Act, Separate Schools were expressly excluded from sharing in the advantages of the application of those moneys for the purchase of maps, apparatus and libraries. On the contrary, I maintained that there was no such exclusive or restrictive clause in the Clergy Reserve Act, much less had I suggested it. What does Mr. Bruyere now say in support of this grave charge and alleged grievance? Not one word—thereby admitting its groundlessness also.

Mr. Bruyere’s “unintentional” mistake about Catholic Books.

A *third* charge made by Mr. Bruyere was that I had inserted in the catalogue of books for public libraries, Hume’s and Gibbon’s Histories, and D’Aubigné’s *History of the Reformation*, whilst I had excluded Lingard’s *Anglo-Saxon Church*, Gahan’s *Church History*, and the *History of the Church*, by Reeve. In refutation of this charge, I shewed that Hume and Gibbon’s Histories were not in the *Index Expurgatorius*, and therefore ought not to be objected to by Mr. Bruyere—that D’Aubigné’s *History of the Reformation* was not in the catalogue, while the three histories mentioned by Mr. Bruyere as having been excluded, were all contained in the catalogue, and in addition to these histories, the catalogue contained Lingard’s *His-*

(*d*) ’Tis rather strange to find the “writing official” of the Government joining with the denouncers of the National School System. Wonder “what’s in the wind?”

tory of England, Mylius' *History of England*, Fredet's *Ancient History*, and Fredet's *Modern History*—all standard Roman Catholic histories, and all inserted on the recommendation of Bishop de Charbonnel himself, on my application to him. What justification does Mr. Bruyere set up for such scandalous charges? None whatever, and the only apology he makes is that "his mistake was quite unintentional!" (e) I have to observe in reply, that neither the public nor myself are concerned with Mr. Bruyere's *intentions*, but with his *statements*, which are shewn to be unfounded in regard both to what they deny and what they assert of a printed catalogue of books and a system of libraries affecting the whole country, and adopted by the Council of Public Instruction—a Council composed of gentlemen of the highest honour, intelligence and integrity. (f)

Mr. Bruyere does not like the correspondence on Catholic teachings in Common Schools.

The *fourth* and last principal charge preferred by Mr. Bruyere was, that in the Common School System, Christianity was not recognized—that the schools were godless and infidel—and that I was employing every means in my power to injure and destroy the Roman Catholic Church. In reply, I simply gave an official correspondence that had recently taken place between Mr. Bruyere and myself, which disproved his statements and charge in every particular. What now is Mr. Bruyere's defence of such statements and imputations? His only defence is, that the correspondence ought not to have been made public, and has nothing to do with the subject!

Mr. Bruyere's Four Charges disproved or abandoned.

Thus have Mr. Bruyere's four principal arguments and charges been disproved, and shown to be entirely groundless. It now remains for me to dispose of some of his miscellaneous statements.

Mr. Bruyere on Hume and Gibbon.

1. He says:—"The Chief Superintendent of Education asserts that neither Gibbon nor Hume are to be found in his libraries." I asserted nothing of the kind: my argument was the reverse. I said they were not in the *Index Expurgatorius*—showing thereby that Mr. Bruyere had no authority to object to them, even in regard to Roman Catholic readers. Yet on this palpable misrepresentation of what I said, the *Leader* has, in most offensive terms, charged me with having been "convicted of falsehood." (g)

His 'intentions' about other Books.

2. Mr. Bruyere says:—"I repeat again, on the authority of the catalogue before me, Cardinal Wiseman's *Lectures on the principal Doctrines of the Catholic Church*, are not in the catalogue." Who ever said those lectures were in the catalogue? I said expressly that all *controversial* works, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic—and, I may add, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Baptist, or Methodist—were excluded from the libraries, as inconsistent with their objects; and, therefore, such works as the above

(e) That is, he made assertions about matters of which he knew nothing; and when found out and exposed, of course it was "quite unintentional!" and the *Leader* petted him as a "pattern controversial writer."

(f) Of which Bishop Charbonnel is one.

(g) Happy Mr. Bruyere! The "independent and noble," of course, could see nothing wrong in your false statements about Catholic histories;—besides, a complimentary touch covers a multitude of sins.

mentioned lectures of Cardinal Wiseman, as well as Bossuet's *Variations*, had not been, and could not be admitted, any more than the masterly Protestant answers to them. But, on the contrary, to prove that the Roman Catholic authors, as such, had not been excluded, I showed that Cardinal Wiseman's *Lectures on the Connection between Science and Revealed Religion*, and Bossuet's *Universal History*, had been inserted in the catalogue. Mr. Bruyere says he did not allude to *these* lectures of Cardinal Wiseman. I have to remark, I can only judge of what he intended by what he said. He said "Cardinal Wiseman's lectures," in absolute terms^(h)—thus including his lectures of every description. I proved the inaccuracy of his statement, by showing that Cardinal Wiseman's *Lectures on the Connection between Science and Revealed Religion*—his best and most popular lectures, and the only ones known or adapted to general readers—were given in the catalogue.

Why there are not more Catholic Books in the Catalogue.

3. Having thus refuted every specific charge made by Mr. Bruyere, relative to the selection of books for the public libraries, I may remark generally, that the catalogue contains the name of every Roman Catholic author of celebrity, in France, Germany, and Italy, whose works are adapted to popular libraries, and have been translated into English; and that if a larger number of such authors is not given in the catalogue, it is simply for the reason assigned by Cardinal Wiseman, when I applied to him for the names of them—they do not exist, and cannot, therefore, be inserted in the catalogue. If nine-tenths, or nineteen-twentieths of the works in the English language, on civil polity, political economy, progress of society, science, arts, manufactures, every branch of natural history, and human industry, as well as works of taste, literature, and the imagination, are productions of Protestant authors, public libraries embracing those subjects—and not questions of controversial divinity—must be proportionally composed of the works of such authors. And it is a blessing for which we cannot be too thankful, or value too highly, that since the resurrection of the human mind, three centuries since, from the lethargy and enslavement in which it had been buried during the "dark ages," mental activity has so followed upon the footprints of mental liberty, as to produce such vast treasures of knowledge, such abundant sources of entertainment, and such powerful levers of social advancement, for ourselves and for our children. What would the British empire be without them? Spain and Italy can answer.

Mr. Bruyere's Quotations from Laing, for which see page 16, *ante*.

4. Mr. Bruyere has written and quoted much to show the immorality of the School system in the United States, and has re-produced Bishop De Charbonnel's quotations from the traveller Laing (not a clergyman) on schools in Italy. If so much crime exists in the States of North America, where there are systems of public schools, the States of South America show how much worse would be the condition of those States did not such schools exist. But I have shown more than once that, in four essential features, our Canadian school system differs from that in the United States, in regard to the *religious* element; and in my published correspondence with Bishop de Charbonnel, I have disposed of the quota-

(h) Ah! where was the *Leader*? Could that be the model "style" of argument?

tations from Laing—a correspondence fresh in the recollection of the public, though it appears not so in that of Mr. Bruyere.

Conscientious Convictions against the Schools lately manufactured to order.

5. Again, Mr. Bruyere says—"The CREED of Catholics is termed by Dr. Ryerson, 'Conscientious Convictions manufactured to order.' So far from there being a particle of truth in this statement, my whole letter proved that in the school law and its administration, I had shown a consideration to the creed, feelings and even scruples of Roman Catholics, which had not been shown to any Protestant denomination in Upper Canada. I spoke not of the creed of Roman Catholics, which has existed for centuries, but of convictions produced against our public school system, by the infusion of a new foreign element since the days of Bishops McDonell and Power, and with which a large portion of the Roman Catholics have no sympathy. (i) My words were as follows: "I should falsify the whole of my past life, and despise myself, were I not scrupulous to protect the rights and feelings of Roman Catholics equally with those of any or all other classes of the community. It is certain of their own ecclesiastics who have inflicted upon them burdens and disadvantages which their fathers had not to bear in the days of Bishop McDonell and Power, who have made that a mortal sin at a municipal school election, which was formerly no sin at all; who deny the ordinances for attending schools, an attendance at which was formerly encouraged, when those schools were more exceptionable than at present. The conscientious convictions, of which Mr. Bruyere speaks, have been manufactured to order, as also the mortal sins which are charged upon some Roman Catholics." It is thus clear that I had no more reference to the creed of the Roman Catholic Church, than to that of any Protestant Church, but to injunctions against the public schools which have been laid upon Roman Catholics in the Diocese of Toronto, by their bishop, and which Mr. Bruyere has misnamed "Conscientious Convictions of Catholics"—but convictions of which Catholics knew nothing until the infusion of the new foreign element, and which are as abhorrent to the feelings of a large portion if not the great majority of Catholics, as they are inconsistent with their dignity as men, and their rights as Christians and citizens.

Bishop Power was a Friend of Common Schools.

6. Mr. Bruyere has attempted to prove that the lamented Bishop Power entertained the newly imported views on the subject of separate *versus* the public schools. As well might he attempt to prove that light is darkness. Bishop Power acted as a member and Chairman of the Provincial Board of Education up to within less than a week of his death, advised upon and concurred in all the regulations relative to the Normal, Model and Common Schools of Upper Canada; (j) the selection of text books, &c., was honored after his decease by an unanimous resolution of the Board as to his character and services, and afterwards eulogized by me (who was absent at the time of his death) in a public and published address. As well might Mr. Bruyere have the boldness to attribute his sentiments to all the

(i) Aye! and rumor tells of a strong antagonism between Bishop Charbonnel and a distinguished relative of one of these Canadian Bishops, on this very question.

(j) And one of his most urgent appeals to the Municipalities, in behalf of the Normal School, was that it would be "the means of providing all the Schools of the Province with *native teachers, trained for the country, as well as in it.*"

other members of the Board, including myself, as to ascribe them to Bishop Power. Nay, the ideas as well as "convictions," as to the mortal sins of sending children to the public schools, or voting for a school trustee, or councillor, or legislator, except at the order of the Bishop, have been manufactured since the days of the lamented Bishop Power, to the surprise, and reproach and injury of the Roman Catholics, as well as to the disturbance of the peace, and hitherto harmonious educational progress of the country.

Mr. Bruyere's opinion of the majority of the Catholic laity in Canada.

7. In reply to my assertion that Roman Catholic children who have been taught in the mixed schools, are as good Roman Catholics as those who have been taught in the separate schools, Mr. Bruyere delivers himself as follows:—"On the authority of the oldest and best informed Catholic clergymen of Canada, I am able to assert that, with a few honorable exceptions, these sound Roman Catholics, educated in mixed schools, may be honorable men, honest men, according to the Protestant sense of the word, but practical, religious, scrupulous observers of the rules of their Church, they are not.

Considers them Half Heathens !

They are Catholics in name, Protestant, or half heathen in practice. (k) They are Protestant to all intents and purposes. Therefore we can well afford to give them up to the Chief Superintendent of Education. They are as Catholic and Protestant as himself." Now as the separate schools are only recent, and few and far between in Upper Canada, it follows that nineteen-twentieths if not ninety-nine hundredths of the Roman Catholics who have received any education in Upper Canada, have been educated in the mixed schools; (l) and Mr. Bruyere himself admits that all of them, with a few exceptions, are of my views, and not of his, on the system of public schools. This is a conclusive though unwitting testimony, that the newly imported dogmas and assumptions of Bishop De Charbonnel and Mr. Bruyere, are as alien to the views and feelings of the great majority of the Roman Catholics, as they are subversive of their rights and social interests. According to Mr. Bruyere there was no sound Romanism in Upper Canada before the recent importations, and there are no sound Roman Catholics out of the assumed, 150,000 bearing that name, save the "few honorable exceptions" that bow their necks to the new yoke, and their understandings to the new vocabulary of saintly virtues and mortal sins, which have been lately manufactured for the perfection of their humiliation and enslavement. (m) In the past days of Bishops McDonell and Power, and their clergy,—who like them had grown up under British Institutions and knew by privations, experience, and labors, how to sympathize with the wants, circumstances, and interests of their people,—it appears, on Mr. Bruyere's authority, the Roman Catholics were only so in name, while they were "half-heathen in practice" as are their successors at the present day, whom Mr. Bruyere gives up, by wholesale, to the Chief Superintendent of Education.

(k) Complimentary, certainly, to the laity of his Church,—because they dare to act upon their own convictions, instead of those manufactured for their use by the "new element."

(l) And continue to be so educated. The "foreign element" has only been able to *force* the establishment of schools in about 40 or 50 municipalities, leaving nearly 400, containing about 3000 school divisions, uninfluenced.

(m) So, then, Mr. Bruyere is *not* the "humble representative." In fact, by his own showing, he is indignantly repudiated by an enormous majority, and can only speak for "the few exceptions" that yield to the "foreign element."

Dr. Ryerson accepts the Charge of the "Half Heathens"

I will cheerfully accept the charge, and treat this large class of my fellow citizens with the same consideration and solicitude that I have always shewn for their welfare as well as for their rights—knowing that neither is consulted by the party of Mr. Bruyere, a Falstaff company, by his own confession, of "a few honorable exceptions" in the great body of the Roman Catholic community; and the sequel will show, whether the great majority of the Roman Catholic youth taught in the public schools in connection with their fellow countrymen, will, like many of their pioneer predecessors, stand in the first rank of the intellectual, distinguished, and prosperous men of their neighbourhood and country; or whether such distinction will attach to the "few honourable exceptions" of those and their children, whom Mr. Bruyere's party shall isolate from all that is progressive, elevating, and invigorating in the country—shall teach the new catalogue of mortal sins, with their accompanying "Conscientious convictions," that all Protestants are infidels—general knowledge, poison,—and Great Britain the most infidel and execrable empire on earth.

The new Foreign Element intruding upon Canadian rights—Necessity for confronting them.

The assumptions of this new foreign element in our country might not require public notice, were they confined to their unfortunate victims; but when they are made the cloak of assailing public law and its administration; when they presume to command and denounce in the Council Chamber of Government, and in the halls of Legislation, and give peremptory orders, enforced with pains and penalties, at every political, municipal and school election throughout Upper Canada; when they seek to defame and destroy every institution and agency for the diffusion of general education and knowledge, and even demand state support to teach that the great majority of the inhabitants of the state and their institutions are infidels and infidel agencies—enemies of God and man; when they become an active element of party in regard to every public man, and every public question, and public measure, whether in the Provincial Government, or in the Local Municipality, and thus aim at controlling or destroying every man, and every institution in the land,—they then reach a crisis of invasion which can no longer be evaded, but must be confronted by every man, of every rank and party who values liberty of action, word, or thought just government, and free, institutions. (n)

Mr. Bruyere's *first* opinion that the parent not the state should control.

8. Finally, passing over many petty misrepresentations, I must say a word on that great doctrine or moral and political science flippantly propounded by Mr. Bruyere in the following sentences:—"To the parents, not to the State, the child belongs: so, at least, the God of law and nature proclaims. From the parents what power on earth can snatch him?" (o) The theory thus laid down is that the parent has everything and the State nothing to do with the child,—the one is placed in opposition to the other

(n) Aye! and it is on account of the very freeness of our institutions, that the "foreign element" intrudes upon privileges here which are denied in other lands, and which, by inherent right, pertain only to the subjects of a free State.

(o) Therefore the Church, "a power on earth," has no right to interfere with the parents, or to manufacture "conscientious convictions" for them; or even to whisper a fearful catalogue of "mortal sins." Ah! *Leader*, see what you lost by being called "noble and independent!"

a dangerous error, and practical absurdity. By the State is meant the whole body of the people united under one government; and in the best organized State the interests of the whole community are binding upon each member, and the strength of the whole community is exerted for the protection of each member.

What are the acknowledged relations of the State?

The State, therefore, so far from having nothing to do with the children, constitutes their collective parent, and is bound to protect them against any unnatural neglect or cruel treatment, on the part of the individual parent, and to secure to them, all that will qualify them to become useful citizens of the State. Thus if the individual parent should starve, maim, or murder the child, would not the State, or collective parent, have something to do in regard to the child? Has not the State had something to do for the protection of factory children in England—to protect them against the the cupidity of the individual parent, and secure to them the opportunity and means of instruction? And if the State has so much to do with the *body* of the child, has it not by a stronger reason, something to do with the child's *mind* also,—to see that it is not starved, maimed and converted into an enemy and danger to the State, instead of being an intelligent and useful member of it?

. Duty of the state to educate.

Now our Public School system, instead of exceeding the legitimate power of the State, or of the whole people in their collective capacity, in regard to the child, comes short of it. Based upon the principle that individual ignorance is the public evil, the State or whole people provides for its removal and prevention by establishing schools for the education of all the children,—reserving to their individual parents, the supreme control as to their *religious* instruction. But the State or collective people should proceed a step further, and see, not only that provision is made for the instruction of each child, but that each child should receive somewhere a certain amount or certain period of instruction,—that if an individual parent should be so unnatural as to deprive his children of their divine and human birth-right of mental food and clothing, and therefore mental growth and power, and starve and maim them by cruel neglect or abuse, the State or collective parent should interpose for the protection of such helpless children—worse than orphans—and save them from such irreparable wrongs and injuries. This is a power with which the State through the several municipalities of the land should be invested—a power with which I proposed to invest them by a draft of bill and communication submitted to government two years ago—a power which has lately been suggested by two Judges of the Supreme Courts—the one in a recent address to a Grand Jury, the other in a still more recent address to the Canadian Institute. Thus the State or collective people, is the helper of every good, and especially of every poor parent, in the education of his children and the legitimate guardian of children against the cruel neglect and wrongs of bad and unnatural parents.

Mr. Bruyere's *second* opinion, that the Church not the parent should control.

But Mr. Bruyere says the State, or society at large, through any of its organs or agencies, has nothing to do with the child—the individual parent is absolute. Yet how does this pretext set up to exclude a class of children

from the public schools accord with the practice of his party? Bishop de Charbonnel and Mr. Bruyere say to the State, you have no business or concern with the education of children, especially one class of them—they belong absolutely to their parents; and then turning to those parents they say, those children are not yours, but ours; (*p*) and if you send them to the public schools to which you have been accustomed, you are guilty of mortal sin, you shall be deprived of the ordinances of the church; and if you, or your children die, you shall be buried like dogs. This is what Mr. Bruyere calls “freedom of education”—a depotism in the State over the State,—a depotism in the family over the parent—a surrender of the rights and functions of both the State and the parent to a clerical absolutism under which humanity writhes and society retrogrades.

In conclusion, I beg to call the attention of public men of all parties to the following important facts:—

The school system unassailable.

1. That every charge against our school system and its administration as partial or unjust in regard to school appropriations, libraries, or maps and apparatus for schools, has utterly failed; and to persevere in hostility when the grounds are shown to be false, shows that the object is not truth, not the diffusion of education or knowledge, not equal rights and privileges among all classes, but immunities, and powers inconsistent with the rights of individual municipalities, or constitutional government itself.

No argument attempted by the ultra Montanists.

2. That though in my last *Annual Report*, I have explained the Christian and fundamental principles of the school system, its perfect impartiality to all parties, the peculiar indulgences to Roman Catholics, and the unconstitutional and subversive character of the new demands of the party of Bishop de Charbonnel and Mr. Bruyere; yet has not Mr. Bruyere, nor one of the newspapers in his interest, attempted to combat one of the principles, facts, or arguments of that Report, but they have sought to divert attention from their own pretensions and the great principles of the school system, by reiterating groundless imputations against it, and making gross attacks upon me—yet concealing from their readers my answers to those attacks. (*q*)

No offence to conscience given in the common schools.

3. That the oft repeated attempt to show the inequality of the Separate School provisions of the law, has been so thoroughly exposed as to be apparently abandoned; nor has Mr. Bruyere adduced, or attempted to adduce, a single fact to show that anything is taught, or done in the public schools to proselyte Roman Catholic children, or that is inconsistent with the wishes of their parents; nor has he been able to fix upon a single partial or disobliging act in my administration of the department during the last ten years even towards my assailants; so much so, that the chief burden of his charges against the public schools now amounts to little more than the society of Protestant children, against associating with whom “conscientious convictions” are pleaded; and for Roman Catholic children to be

(*p*) Whew! Mr. Bruyere—didn’t—exactly—mean—that! The statement was purely “unintentional!!” Where was the *Leader*?

(*q*) Perhaps the grand object of all these tirades of this new “foreign element,” is to court outside controversy, because the inside compulsion of “mortal sins” and patented “convictions” fail to crush the sympathies of Canadian Catholics for the public institutions of their country.

taught, or habituated to regard them otherwise than as little infidels, and their religion as infidelity, would be "dangerous to faith and morals!" But yet instead of proceeding quietly with their own Separate Schools, the "conscientious convictions" of Mr. Bruyere and his party seem to prompt them to do little more than assail the public schools, and every measure adopted for their efficiency and usefulness. (r)

Conclusion.—Practice of Free Countries in regard to Education.

4. That in every enlightened country provision is made by the State for the education of youth—that in every free country where there is no political connection between Church and State, there has, without exception, provision been made for the education of all classes of its youth, without respect to any sect or hierarchy—equally protecting the rights of all parties, but permitting the exclusion or domination of none. In every such country, there always have been individuals, especially individual ecclesiastics, who, advocating the connection between Church and State, have assailed the moral character and tendency of all schools and educational systems not carried on through the Church. Pamphlets, statistics, and appeals without end are put forth to sustain these forlorn hopes of Church and State yearnings. In the neighbouring States such publications are no longer heeded; the people proceed with the education of their children, regardless of the efforts of these ecclesiastics to usurp the control of it from the rightful parents. In the statistics of crime these partizans never inform you how many of the youthful culprits have attended the public school, and how many have never been in a school—that in the cities of the United States, as in Toronto and other Canadian towns, the criminals are those who have been kept from the schools—seldom or never those who have regularly attended the schools—that, did all the children attend the schools, there would be a great decrease instead of increase of juvenile crime. The system of popular education in Upper Canada differs from that of any other state in America, not merely in the fact that the clergy of all religious persuasions are recognized as co-workers, and that Christian principles and feelings in the highest and largest sense, pervade the text books used in the schools; but in that the parents of each municipality without interfering with the rights or scruples of any individual, can make their school as religious as they please, in regard to both exercises and instruction; in that every possible facility and assistance are given them to do so, but no *compulsion* is attempted in matters of religion, any more than in regard to the establishment of schools themselves; not a school or library can be established, nor an article of school apparatus procured, without local voluntary municipal action. The school taxing power rests exclusively with the inhabitants of each municipality to provide for the education of their children; the working of the system is for the people a practical school of liberty as well as a potent means of education and knowledge and the warfare against it is an invasion of powers, privileges and aids, which have been conferred by law upon the municipalities of the country, and form a part and parcel of the constitutional rights of the people.

E. RYERSON.

Toronto, 14th January, 1857

(r) But poor Mr. Bruyere! though he commenced the war, complains bitterly that he was not allowed to go on with his Separate Schools in peace!

No. 16. Rev. J. M. Bruyere's Second Rejoinder to Dr. Ryerson.

TO THE CONDUCTORS OF THE PRESS IN CANADA.

Mr. Bruyere lectures on candor, and gives another sample of the model style.

Without possessing much of the sterling worth of the female sex, Dr. Ryerson is not altogether free from the failings occasionally attributed to the senile portion of the daughters of Eve. His reverence is loquacious, profuse of epithets, sometimes abusive, not unfrequently scurrilous, and incessantly stunning your years with charges a hundred times refuted. Woman like, the Chief Superintendent is bent upon having the last word. Much as I would wish to gratify the odd notions of my worthy antagonist, I cannot as yet let him have his own way. His last communication to the public, in the *Leader* of the 16th instant, contains so much that is false, foreign to the subject, unfair, with the usual amount of sophistical Ryersonism pervading the whole, that I feel reluctantly compelled to give his reverence another lecture on candour and honesty. Dr. Ryerson was the first to raise the war whoop, by addressing to the Municipalities his injudicious circular, which has been well characterized by a cotemporary, as "a document fraught with the most consummate presumption and reflecting directly upon the capacity and intelligence of all the Municipalities of this section of the country."

Again represents the Circular as "dictation," but gives his advice.

Regardless of the fact that the moneys accruing from the secularized Clergy Reserves, were to become the common stock; alike the property of Protestants and Catholics, Dr. Ryerson attempts to dictate to our intelligent Municipalities in Upper Canada, how they should expend the large sums of money placed under their control. Actuated by feelings of a liberal and christian policy, the municipal corporations think it but just and right, to distribute them among the whole community, without any reference to party, creed or nationality. The Chief Superintendent of Education, in a spirit of narrow-mindedness and hostility, to the 1,150,000 Catholics scattered over this Province, seeks to disfranchise them from their share in the Clergy Reserves, by calling upon the Municipalities to apply these resources not to general purposes, as originally intended by the Legislators who passed the Act of Secularization, but to his Schools and Libraries, to the purchase of books, maps, globes, charts, and other school apparatus from which Catholics can derive no more benefit than the Hot-tentots of Southern Africa.^(s) I may be permitted to repeat, that Catholics have conscientious objections to the Common School system, and to the Public Libraries, composed almost exclusively of Protestant books. Of the validity of our "conscientious objections," of course, no secular tribunal, not even the Chief Superintendent of Education, can take cognizance, without thereby violating the rights of conscience.

And says that Catholics are excluded from sharing.

Should the proceeds arising from the secularized Reserves, in compliance with Dr. Ryerson's suggestions, be turned exclusively to the account of these darling institutions, Catholics would be deprived of their share of the fund in question. In the name of the whole Catholic body

(s) A "dark" contrast. Similar to Bishop Charbonnel on the Catholics of Chatham. See page 1.

in this Province, and on the part of 1,150,000 human beings, I have raised my feeble voice against the crying injustice perpetrated by the Chief Superintendent of Education. Is it just, I repeat again, is it fair, to apply exclusively to the use of one portion of our community, what was destined for general purposes? (t) Is it fair, is it just, on the part of Dr. Ryerson, to urge upon the different Municipalities, the propriety of expending the common stock arising from the sale of the secularized Clergy Reserves, in enriching Protestant Schools to the exclusion of Catholic Separate Schools (u) in getting up Protestant Libraries, composed almost exclusively of books teeming with insulting diatribes against the Catholic community? Such is the question at issue between Dr. Ryerson and myself. Such is the position from which he started in his famous circular to the heads of City, Town, Township and Village Municipalities in Upper Canada, on the appropriation of the Clergy Reserve Fund. To this position, I hold him fast.

Mr. Bruyere means something perhaps at the following "lot of words."

My cunning antagonist, having discovered, but too late, that he had taken a wrong step, flies off with the rapidity of lightning, from the subject in question. Instead of vindicating by fair argument, like an honest man, his suggestion to the Municipalities, he finds it more convenient for himself to touch upon everything, except the question at issue. In his second reply to my rejoinder, the Chief Superintendent of Education speaks in the accents of injured innocence, "of gross personalities which accord so entirely with the taste and feelings of the *Leader*, as to be regarded by him as a pattern of controversial style." Of course the good Doctor who, so frequently takes great delight in flinging the opprobrious epithets of *an infusion of a new foreign element* in the face of Catholic Bishops and Priests, and French, German, Irish, and Scotch Catholics of foreign birth, must be absolved of the obnoxious imputation. If we are to give credit to the persecuted Chief Superintendent, *even the treatment of common decency, if not gentlemanly courtesy*, is withheld from him. Of course the sensitive Doctor need not be so particular about *common decency*, when he ventures to charge Catholic Bishops and Priests *with treating the immortal mind of Roman Catholics just as the American slaveholder does the mortal bodies of his slaves*. Instead of sticking to his thesis, (v) my wily opponent finds it more to his taste, to indulge in a few of the ordinary common-place declamations of the meeting house, about "clerical absolutism, under which humanity withers and society retrogrades." In one part of the learned document, we have the usual deceptive cry about "the resurrection of the human mind, from the lethargy and enslavement in which it had been buried during the *Dark Ages*." Were this the place, I might easily show his weak minded Reverence that the "*Dark Ages*" have no existence, except in the dark cranium of the Chief Superintendent of Education and others of his stamp.

Mr. Bruyere gives a lecture on good manners.

For the second, third and fifth time, my persevering antagonist will try his hand at Bishop De Charbonnel, whom he politely calls an importation from

(t) No; of course not. The law may easily be appealed to.

(u) Wrong again! Any Separate School may share, if it likes. *Query* "for Mr. B." If all the Public Schools are "Protestant," how comes it that Catholic teaching is given in some of them, and that, too, according to Dr. Ryerson's interpretation of the law? And how comes it that 396 Catholic Teachers are employed in these "Protestant" Schools?

(v) Would that Mr. Bruyere had!

a foreign clime, "manufacturing conscientious convictions of which Catholics knew nothing until the infusion of the new foreign element into this country." In the absence of his Lordship, who is now in Europe, I beg leave to thank Dr. Ryerson for his lectures on good manners. I may be permitted also, *en passant*, to remark that this frequent repetition of a language worthy of the fish market, betrays a great scarcity of words and of thoughts, and a low tone of education. Spain and Italy will feel, in their turn, the unsparing lash of the Chief Superintendent. Unfortunate Spain, poor benighted Italy, will the light of Ryersonism ever shine upon your mountains and valleys, and dispel the clouds of ignorance hovering over you? It is true, Rome the capital of Italy, with a population of 158,678 souls, has only *three hundred and eighty-one* Free Schools, with about *five hundred* teachers, and *fourteen thousand* children attending them; a University, with an average attendance of six hundred and sixty students, besides other Institutions of learning, Seminaries, and Academies for the teaching of the higher branches.(w)

Comparison of Italy, Prussia and the Common Schools of the City.

It is true, the Papal States, with a population of two and a half millions, contain seven Universities, whilst Prussia, with a population of fourteen millions, has but seven. But what is all this let me ask, compared with the blaze of light continually issuing from Dr. Ryerson's Model Schools, in which 1,570 children out of a Protestant population of 29,550 receive an education at a yearly cost of four pounds ten shillings and four pence per head? The average attendance in our Catholic Separate Schools, out of a Catholic population of 12,210, last year, was 1286. The total receipts for the support of these schools, during the same year, including city taxes(x) and Legislative grants, amounted to £545. I leave it to the public to judge whether the cause of education would not be more effectually promoted, and public economy better consulted, if each denomination was allowed to have its own Separate Schools. The above is the daily attendance and cost of our matchless Common Schools in Toronto.

The "extreme kindness" of the *Leader* rewarded.

Even the *Leader*, who has had the extreme kindness to open its columns for the insertion of *the Doctor's* effusions, will occasionally get a rap from the ferule of my fretful opponent, for *violating editorial propriety*, by joining in Mr. Bruyere's attacks. In reference to this strange demeanor of the Chief Superintendent, I hope I shall not be blamed if I say, that his last reply to me sustains but too well the peevish character of the old Dame sitting at the corner of the domestic hearth, fretting, wrangling, and scolding all those who come in her way, and differ from her views. Why my sensitive antagonist should thus give way to his temper, I am at a loss to understand.

Mr. Bruyere concludes that mazes and wanderings are wrong.

I repeat it again; all these mazes and wanderings have nothing to do with the question at issue. Had Dr. Ryerson confined himself within the debated point, his long communication, extending to *twenty-three foolscap*

(w) And the institution of French bayonets for teaching how they are all to be used, and "authority respected."

(x) If Separate Schools receive "city taxes," why not also the city's maps and books, if bought with funds to which *all* have contributed?

pages (y) might easily have been reduced to a few lines more characteristic of a sensible man.

And that he is bound by no rule of controversy.

If I appeal to an impartial public, I am sure they will sustain me, when I assert that I am not bound by any rule of controversy, to follow my slippery antagonist through all his intricacies and meanderings,

At last Mr. Bruyere comes to the point.

What is to be done with the Clergy Reserves Funds? Shall they be applied to general purposes, for the benefit of all, or shall they be turned to the private use of one portion of our community? Such is the question which the Chief Superintendent attempted to solve in his famous circular addressed to the Municipalities of Upper Canada, by deciding that they should go all, or at least, in part, to his State Schools and Public Libraries. In vain will the Doctor plead, that Catholics may avail themselves of the common boon, by going to his Schools and drinking at the spring of intellectual knowledge flowing from his Public Libraries. For reasons already assigned, and which will be, if necessary, further submitted to his kind consideration. Catholics can have, and will have, nothing to do with his State Schools and Public Libraries. Unwilling, however, to ruffle the sensitiveness of the good Doctor, I consent to humor him, for a little while, by entering at once, upon the examination of the various charges contained in his last reply to my rejoinder.

Sample of the Model Style.

The Rev. gentleman begins by uttering a loud shout of triumph at the victory won over his opponent, who, if we are to believe Dr. Ryerson, has not a word to say in support of some two or three grave charges, and alleged grievances. This premature exultation of the good Doctor, will remind many of one of the feathered tribe who sings her song of jubilation before she has laid her egg.

Separate Schools excluded from share of Reserves.

1st. I asserted in my communication to the conductors of the Press in Canada, that Catholic Separate Schools were precluded from any share in the distribution of the Clergy Reserves Funds. I repeat the charge and challenge my opponent to show how Catholics could be permitted to partake of the common stock, in presence of the legislation on the subject. I repeat again: the law is in our way. The Clergy Reserves Secularization Bill which passes over the funds accruing from their sale to the different Municipalities is accompanied by a restrictive clause that they shall be applied exclusively to those purposes for which municipal funds are applicable. But Municipalities, by a former Act of Parliament, are expressly forbidden from employing any portion of funds placed at their disposal, to the use of Separate Schools. (z) Does it not, therefore, follow, as I complained in my first communication, that Catholics are most unjustly cut off from any share in the distribution of the above named resources. What matters it, whether the restrictive clause be contained in the Secularization Bill, as I unintentionally stated, or in a former legislative enact-

(y) Query, as to the number of pages in this letter. Ah! *Leader*, pray do tell!

(z) See Dr. Ryerson's letter, p. 45 "In regard to these [supplying maps and libraries by Clergy Reserve Funds] the Separate Schools and the Roman Catholics are placed upon precisely the same footing as the Public Schools, and the other classes of the population." The "independent and noble" of the *Leader* could see no "falsehood" in Mr. Bruyere's assertions. It shows how completely he is with the "foreign and ultramontane element."

ment? Is not the result the same? viz., making the Reserves applicable to Common Protestant Schools only, and precluding Catholic Separate Schools from any share of the same? Therefore, the Municipalities, which are at liberty to apply either the whole or at least, a part, of the Clergy Reserves funds, to Common Schools, cannot devote a farthing to the use of Catholic Separate Schools. (a) Therefore, again, Doctor Ryerson committed a most palpable injustice when he suggested to the Municipalities the application of these funds, exclusively to the use of his fellow Protestants. If I disdained in my rejoinder to notice his Reverence's reply to the grievance, it was not because I admitted its groundlessness, as he says, but because his pitiful sophistry was undeserving of an answer.

Separate Schools not furnished with Maps, &c.

2. I complained, in my first communication, that whilst Common or Protestant Schools, should Dr. Ryerson's suggestion to the Municipalities be acted upon, would be abundantly furnished with maps, charts, globes, &c., &c., Catholic Separate Schools would be deprived of the same advantages. To this, what does Dr. Ryerson say? In his first reply, he simply says that "Separate Schools in Upper Canada, have precisely the same facilities for providing themselves with maps, charts, globes, &c., &c., as the Common Schools." In his second reply, taking advantage of my silence on his fresh quibble and sophistry, he repeats that there is the same provision for supplying Separate, as well as Public Schools with maps and apparatus, and that many Separate Schools had been provided with them by him. Son of Wesley, speak the truth once in your life? Separate Schools have the same facilities for providing themselves with maps, charts, globes, &c., &c., as Common Schools, that is to say, both Catholics and Protestants can purchase school apparatus at the educational department; both Catholics and Protestants have the privilege of leaving their money in the hands of Dr. Ryerson, and getting in return school apparatus. So far, both are placed on a footing of perfect equality. This I grant with the greatest pleasure, and may this concession rejoice the heart of my worthy friend of the Education Office. But, should the suggestions of the Doctor be taken into consideration by the Municipalities, what would be the difference between Catholics and Protestants? There it is, dear Doctor: whilst Protestants would be able to purchase globes, maps, charts, &c., &c., with the money accruing from the Clergy Reserve Fund, Catholics would have to procure the same with money taken from their own pockets. The disfranchised class composed of Catholics, (b) would have to draw upon their own individual resources, whilst the most favored class, consisting of Protestants, would have the trouble simply of using the Clergy Reserve Funds: a trifling difference indeed, not worth noticing by Dr. Ryerson. So much for the silence with which I tacitly confess the utter groundlessness of my charge.

Mr. Bruyere should not be troubled about his mistake. It was only a "sham."

3. The next very serious charge is about the books for Public Libraries. Great ado is made about a straw; clouds of dust are kicked up, so as to darken the heavens and blind the readers. What are, after all, these

(a) Wrong! Dr. Ryerson has held that the Public and Separate *Common* Schools, established under the School Laws, have an equal right to share in the maps or books purchased with the Reserves because all contribute.

(b) And yet Mr. Bruyere, in a former part of his letter, acknowledges the receipt of "city taxes" for his Separate Schools; and is, doubtless, aware that Separate Schools, in other places, have shared in municipal taxes! He forgets that the rule of exclusion depends upon non-contribution.

scandalous charges to come to? Some few books, not half a dozen, were mentioned by me through an unintentional mistake, as having been excluded from, or inserted in, Dr. Ryerson's Catalogue. On the strength of this pretended false statement, the Chief Superintendent was wroth, and in the height of his virtuous indignation, exclaims, "I have to observe that neither the public nor myself are concerned with Mr. Bruyere's intentions, but with his statements."—Good Doctor, keep cool, neither the public nor myself are to be duped by your ridiculous fuss about nothing. To judge of the preposterous importance attached by Dr. Ryerson to the unintentional exclusion or inclusion of some few books, I may be permitted to repeat, that out of over 4,000 works mentioned in the Catalogue, not perhaps twenty works came from the pens of sound Catholic authors.

How bad books are condemned—*nominatim* or *in globo*.

4. With a noble pertinacity, the Chief Superintendent clings to his *Index Expurgatorius*. Very little, indeed, does he know about the *Index Expurgatorius*. Had the good doctor been in the least conversant with the Roman practice in reference to bad books, he would have known that the Church does not and cannot put in the *Index* every bad book. Some are condemned *in globo*, that is to say, without mention of the names; others, on the contrary, are condemned *nominatim*, with the express mention of the title. All bad books in general, containing infidel, heretical or immoral doctrines, are condemned by the Church, either *nominatim* or *in globo*. To assert, therefore, that because Hume's and Gibbon's histories are not in the *Index Expurgatorius*, they ought not to be objected to by me, betrays an ignorance which was not to be expected from one who has obtained the pretentious title of Doctor. Had he opened his eyes to the light of common sense, he would have understood that the Church is unable to place on the *Index*, even the hundredth or thousandth part of evil books which are daily issuing forth from an infidel press. As well might Dr. Ryerson say, that the obscene and filthy pamphlets which are hourly handed about on railroad cars and steamboats should all be placed on the *Index*.

Yet "Mr. B." says the *Globe* is not there!

By the same rule it would follow that the *Globe* must be a very correct vehicle of truth, and contains nothing but what is proper, and fit to be read by a decent female, since this wretched sheet is not in the *Index Expurgatorius*. I avail myself of this opportunity to inform his reverence that he is mistaken in regard to Hume and Gibbon. One of them is in the *Index*. That both are in his catalogue, I presume, the Doctor can have no doubt now. Shame on the corruptor of youth, who places in their hands the poison of infidelity and skepticism.

Friends in the country have been looking for Catholic books.

5. In order to enable the public to judge of the character of Dr. Ryerson's Libraries, I will add, that bad as the catalogue is, which contains not over twenty Catholic works, these Public Libraries, got up under the superintendence of a Methodist Minister, particularly those out in the country, are still worse. Since the beginning of this controversy, friends of mine in the country have called at some of these Public Libraries, asking for Catholic books mentioned in the catalogue. These books were not there. Whether they were not for circulation, or whether they were not

at all on the shelves of the Libraries, which is more probable, the fact is, they could not be had. As a general rule, there are none but Protestant works in the Libraries of Dr. Ryerson.

Mr. Bruyere contemplates the thousand shades and shapes among which he lives.

In connection with the above statement, I beg leave to add the following remarks. Of the scheme of Public Libraries got up by the Chief Superintendent of Education, we may say what is daily repeated about Common Schools. They do not suit our community; they are not adapted to its instincts and wants. We are living in a community composed of a thousand shades and shapes. Books to the liking and taste of Protestants will not be relished by Catholics, and *vice versa*; Catholics will not, as a general rule, look into Protestant shelves for mental food. They know from experience that in these productions of Protestant writers, what they hold most sacred is misrepresented and ridiculed. Nor will Protestants, as a general rule, go to Catholic Libraries when they seek for reading matter. Dr. Ryerson should know that Catholics have no more faith in Protestant Libraries, made up of Protestant books, under Protestant agency, than Protestants have in our own Libraries.

And decides upon the one alternative for our divided state.

I repeat again, in the divided state of Christendom, particularly in Upper Canada, Common Libraries for both Protestants and Catholics, are an impossibility. There is, therefore, but one alternative. Let every denomination get up their own Libraries, and purchase books adapted to their own choice and taste. Catholics will never ask for their own private use a cent out of the funds destined for general purposes. They would consider it the greatest injustice to divert to their own exclusive use what the unanimous voice of the nation has declared to be the common stock, the property alike of Protestants and Catholics.

The lessons and voice of an obscure member.

Let me ask of the Chief Superintendent of Education to condescend to take from a Catholic Priest lessons of justice and equity. Let him listen to the voice of an obscure member of the Church of Rome, reminding him of the golden rule once imprinted on his mind by the finger of his Creator, but which has been obliterated by religious prejudices and hatred of his fellow Christians. "Do unto others as you would wish to be done by." Such is our rule, such are the principles which should guide and direct every Christian whose mind is not poisoned by Ryersonian doctrine. I will add, the scheme of Public Libraries, like that of Common Schools, having been weighed in the scale, has been found wanting. The tree has borne its fruit; they have proved most bitter to the taste. I am informed on good authority, that lately in several localities, Protestants, in a spirit of conciliation towards Catholics, their fellow Christians, have already sold out their Public Libraries, judging that these Ryersonian contrivances do not meet the present wants and taste of our community. (c) Thus has a great source of discord been taken from their midst. It is to be hoped that before long all Upper Canada, animated by similar feelings, will come to the same conclusion, and scatter to the wind the great humbug of Dr. Ryerson, viz: his Public Libraries, and substitute in their place Private Libraries, better adapted to the liking of each denomination.

(c) They cannot do it. If so, the above shows that the violation of law is encouraged by the "foreign ecclesiastics."

The infidel school and books.

6. I come to the fourth charge preferred against me by the Chief Superintendent of Education. I am accused by him of having stated "that in the Common School system, Christianity was not recognised—that the schools were Godless and infidel, and that he (Dr. Ryerson) was employing every means in his power to injure and destroy the Roman Catholic Church." Before I answer the charge, I beg to state that the infidel character of Dr. Ryerson's schools, is not the only objection we have to them. We object to them likewise, on the ground that the books used in his Model Schools are not fit to be placed in the hand of a Catholic child, nor any body else. Indeed, there is not a single text-book, even on natural sciences, arts, civil polity, political economy, or any branch of natural history and human industry, there is not a single Protestant production of taste, literature and imagination, but contains more or less that is offensive to Catholics. In proof of what I advance, I will make a few extracts from some of the text books taught in Dr. Ryerson's schools. White's Universal History, one, I believe, of his standard works in the Grammar Schools, stands prominent among objectionable text books. Almost every page of his modern history, especially when it relates to Catholic nations or the Catholic Church, exhibits instances of bigotry and scandalous perversion of truth. For instance, under the head "The Church," the student in history will read, "Many circumstances seem to have contributed to the great ecclesiastical revolution which distinguished this century. *The introduction of image worship had been strenuously resisted.*" The above besides being a falsehood, is a direct insult offered to Catholics as rational beings. Again, in a chapter headed "Luther," "The immediate cause of the Reformation was the gross abuse of indulgences. In 1517, a sale of indulgences was proclaimed as the most effectual means of replenishing his (Leo XII.) treasury. By these, absolution was given for future sins, as well as for past; and they were converted into licenses for violating the most sacred obligations." On the subject of the Council of Trent, the following, among other passages, occurs. "Among the articles decreed by this Council to be implicitly believed are.—The celibacy of the clergy, confession and absolution, the worship of images and relics; the intercession of saints, the adoration and Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary." Behold, reader, how history is taught in Dr. Ryerson's schools. In a book styled "Lectures on Botany," in Lecture 39, under the title "Superstitions with regard to the blossoming of plants," the reader will meet with the following passage: "In the Romish Church, many superstitions exist with regard to certain plants which happen to blossom about the time of some saint's days. In Italy and other countries in the South of Europe, where those superstitions first originated, the dead-nettle being in blossom about the time of St. Vincent's day, a martyr who suffered for Christianity under the Emperor Dioclesian, in the year 304, the flower is consecrated to him. The Winter Hellebore is usually in blossom about the time of the Conversion of St. Paul, supposed to be in commemoration of that event." Again, "The Crown Imperial blossoms in England about the 8th of March, the day of St. Edward, King of the West Saxons; nature thus, as was imagined, honoring the day with a royal flower. It was during the middle ages, when the minds of men were influenced by the blindest superstition, that they thus imagined every operation of nature to be emblematical of some thing connected with

their religious faith." I omit several other passages, reflecting particularly upon superstitious monks and nuns who were, says the lecturer, the authors of these conceits. Thus when Catholic children will expect to read a lecture on Botany and Flowers, they will be treated to a lecture on superstitious monks and nuns. The text book which contains these extracts is fresh from Dr. Ryerson's libraries. I open another standard work lately from the shelves of the Normal School, it is called: "Recreations in Science and Natural Philosophy." Now, who would expect bigotry and prejudices in Natural Philosophy? Such is, however, the case. In a section of the work, headed "Amusing Problems," the following is found:

Mr. Bruyere's "Recreations in Natural Philosophy."

"A certain convent consisted of nine cells, one of which, in the middle, was occupied by a blind Abbess and the rest by her nuns. The good Abbess, to assure herself that the nuns did not violate their vows, visited all their cells, and finding three nuns in each, which made nine in every row, retired to rest. Four nuns, however, went out, and the Abbess returning at midnight to count them, still found nine in each row, and therefore retired as before. The four nuns then came back, each with a gallant, and the Abbess, on paying them another visit, having again counted nine persons in each row, entertained no suspicion of what had taken place. But four more men were introduced, and the Abbess again counting nine persons in each row, retired in the full persuasion that no one had either gone out or come in. How was all this possible?" I leave the solution of the above problem to Dr. Ryerson and his pupils. If there is any impropriety in publishing such scandalous trash, let the blame be fastened on the brow of those who thus attempt to pervert the mind and corrupt the hearts of unsuspecting youth. Such are the Christian principles and feelings, in the highest and largest sense, which, according to Dr. Ryerson, pervade the text books in his schools.

Pleads guilty to the Godless and infidel charges.

I return now to the charge preferred against me by the Chief Superintendent of Education, viz: my stating that in the Common School System Christianity was not recognized, that the schools were godless and infidel, and that Dr. Ryerson was employing every means to injure and destroy the Roman Catholic Church. In answer to the above, I will say that I plead guilty to every one of these charges. With the presumed permission of his Reverence I repeat again what I have already stated on a former occasion, on the same subject. The Common State Schools, built with Catholic as well as Protestant money, are houses of education from which Religion is banished, where the elements of Christianity cannot be inculcated to the rising youth, where the child of Christian parents must be taught practically that all religious systems are equally pleasing, or rather equally indifferent, in the sight of God, be he a believer in the immutable decrees of eternal reprobation, or a follower of the impostor Joe Smith. (c)

Our Common Schools are "importations," does not like them.

Our Common School System is but an importation from Yankee Land, where it has already brought forth its bitter fruits, Deism, irreligion, infidelity, Know-Nothingism. Now, what do our Republican neighbours think of their

once boasted. Common School System? In looking over various statistics and reports of Prison inspectors on the other side of the line, we are struck at the unanimous opinion we meet with, that godless education, that is, mental training, apart from moral and religious instruction, and an increase of crime are co-existing facts. In New York city, where Common School education, next to Massachusetts, has obtained its greatest perfection, Justice Conolly, who last year sat upon the Maine Criminal Bench, reported that for the nine months preceding October 1st, he had himself disposed of *nine thousand three hundred and forty-two cases*, or an average of forty cases daily, excepting Sundays. The Prison inspectors of New Jersey made last January, 1856, the following Report to the State Legislature: "We regret to have to say that we are of opinion that the violation of law by the commission of crime is largely on the increase in our State, and as a natural consequence our penitentiary is full to overflowing." It must be remembered that no State in the Union has made greater efforts for the diffusion of Common School education than New Jersey.

But Mr. Bruyere likes certain "importations" of Yankee-land.

In a meeting held last year in the city of New York, and composed of Professors of colleges, Professor Greenleaf said he knew of thirteen young men who came from one school, and every one of them had rushed headlong into destruction. The same speaker said that one of the teachers had made to him the following declaration: "I think I must change my system of teaching; I think I ought to give a little more moral instruction, for already *two of my scholars have been hung for murder*." Education has been made a matter of State policy in Prussia, and every child is, by the compulsion of the Government, sent to school, and yet we are told that crime is increasing there at a frightful rate. The criminal returns of Great Britain and Ireland, for the last twenty years, demonstrate that the educated criminals are to the uneducated as two to one. In Scotland the educated criminals are about four times the uneducated. Nay, what is still more remarkable, while the number of uneducated criminals, especially in Scotland, is yearly diminishing, that of educated ones is yearly increasing. I gather the above facts from a little pamphlet published by a Protestant Clergyman, styled, "Does the Common School system of the United States prevent Crime?" I regret that the length of this letter prevents me from laying before the public more than the following extract:—"While the intellect is so sharpened and informed, (in the Common Schools) the moral powers are suffered to slumber and dwarf. The multitudes who have left school, so ready in figures, so skilful with the pen, so well instructed in the anatomy of their own bodies and the mechanism of a steam engine, go forth into the world ignorant even of the ten commandments and the Lord's Prayer, with an uninformed and slumbering conscience, with impure and enlarged, but ungoverned desire."

Mr. Bruyere quotes them as authority.

It will not do, as Dr. Ryerson does, to assert that on the State or State Schoolism devolves the duty of forming the child's mind, reserving to the parent and pastor the supreme control as to its religious instruction. In answer to this frivolous but specious objection, my authority goes on saying, "If we could but be assured that the multitudes of the young were receiving a moral training, anywhere outside of the school room, at home,

or at Church, it would somewhat extenuate the enormity which is now perpetrated. But the lamentable fact is, that *five-sixths* of the homes of the land are irreligious, *five-sixths* of the parents of America do not even attend any place of public worship, and are therefore, of course unqualified to give a moral bent and religious instruction to their offspring." "Ought not," adds the same authority, "this charming host, who are so unprovided for, both at home, and at church, in their daily school instruction be made to receive some adequate moral and religious training? But the popular Common School system provides only for the communication of secular knowledge. Now is it to be believed that such a system tends to the glory of God, to the security of human life and property, or to the prevention of crime in general?" From the above fearful facts and many others which I am compelled to omit, the Protestant writer of the pamphlet above named concludes by saying, "Yet let us not be misunderstood. We have not affirmed that education causes crime. We merely affirm that the two are co-existing facts; and that the system of Common School education is attended with an increase of crime, because it is the education of only one side of human nature, and that not the controlling side. Man's moral and religious nature constitutes this other and better, but undeveloped half." Such is the ground on which we also object to the Common School System. Dr. Ryerson's Schools are identical with the godless Schools, on the other side of the line, where they have produced the most lamentable results. The Chief Superintendent himself has confessed that they were formed on the plan of the celebrated Massachusetts Schools.

Mr. Bruyere thinks that one city is the Province.

Let us see what title they have to our gratitude in Toronto; what they have accomplished; their present condition and future prospect. What are our Common Schools doing in this city? I beg to lay before the public the following extract from a Protestant Correspondent of the *Catholic Citizen* in a series of letters addressed by him to the Hon. John A. Macdonald. The last letter shews that the number of children of school age, in the city, (Toronto,) is 8,884. And by Mr. Barber's Report for 1854, the average attendance in all the city free schools, was 1,570. The fact is officially recorded that in a population of 8,884 children of school age, only 1,570 is the average daily attendance. Let us turn to the cost of supporting schools for the daily instruction of 1,570 children. The whole cost for the year 1855, including teacher's salaries, maps and apparatus, rents and repairs of school houses, school books, stationery, fuel and other expenses, including also the interest at 6 per cent., is put down at £7,093 12s. 10d. The cost, then, says the correspondent, of a daily attendance of 1,570 children in the Free Common Schools of Toronto is £4 10s. 4d. per head, for the year 1855. Thus, for the education of Dr. Ryerson's pupils (who seldom fail to insult a priest, when they have an opportunity) (d) the city of Toronto has to pay "four pounds ten shillings and four pence" per head. I have said enough, I trust, to convince every sensible man that the whole machinery of the Chief Superintendent of Education, Common Schools and Public Libraries, are a humbug or grand imposition.

Asks what are the fruits of the Machinery.

If with this enormous amount of money expended in supporting what

(d) To what influence is this due? Is it not to the separating influence which these separate Schools foster? Such things never occurred until this new foreign element commenced the war.

I will not hesitate to call a gigantic imposition, profitable only to those immediately engaged in its management. some desirable result could be obtained, our citizens might, perhaps, submit in silence to this obnoxious burden. But, let me ask, what are the fruits of our boasted School machinery? Has education, after the Ryerson fashion prevented crime? The statistics recently published show that in a city numbering, according to the last census, 42,000 souls, the number of arrests made by the police during the past year, amount to 5,250, against 3,295 in 1855. His Honor Judge Hagarty, in his late charge to the Grand Jury at the opening of the Toronto City Assizes, was struck at the alarming number of juvenile offenders, and remarked: "We may naturally ask how such a crop of young criminals can arise in this land, boasting as it does a widely extended system of Free Schools, supported by munificent assessments on the whole property of the country. I fear the educational statistics of this city can too readily afford an answer." Again, let me ask, does not this unpleasant and unwholesome state of society, convince every sensible man, that here, as in the neighbouring Republic, *modern education, divorced from religion, and an increase of crime, are co-existing facts.*

And quotes gloomy pictures.

In presence of the above alarming facts, it becomes the duty of every man, every christian and citizen, to examine where the evil lies. The able editor of the *Toronto Times*, has on this subject the following sensible remarks: "If the present school system has been tried and found wanting, let us not waste time, that is most precious, in trying it again. Let us not be frightened by the cry of sectarianism from doing our duty to the rising generation. That something should be done for them without delay, cannot be doubted by any one who knows anything of the youth of this most *moral* and well educated city." Next follows a gloomy picture drawn by this earnest and honest citizen, of the alarming condition of the youth in the city of Toronto. That something should be done for the rising generation is no longer doubted; that the present school system cannot, will not rescue it from the frightful abyss it is rushing into, cannot be questioned, except by those whose pecuniary interest is closely connected with the grand imposture. What then should be done for that interesting portion of our community? What should all true christians do for the noble cause of education? If I may be allowed to express my humble opinion, I will attempt to give a solution to this perplexing problem. Let us return to the course pointed out by venerable antiquity, and the experience of all ages. (e) Let us listen to the voice of wisdom and patriotism. Washington's dying injunction was, 'Never allow education to be divorced from religion.' The separation of religion from secular instruction, says the author of the pamphlet already cited, is altogether a novel proceeding. This divorcement of religion from education was unknown to our fathers.

"Let us all adopt Mr. Bruyere's scheme."

Since both reason and experience teach that religion and secular education ought always to go hand in hand, the question arises, how shall this be accomplished? We are living in a community divided into various and large religious bodies. Catholics, members of the Church of England, Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, Christians of every name. When

(e) Which was, to educate a few, and leave the vast majority ignorant.

children of those numerous christian denominations are assembled together to receive instruction, shall a Catholic priest present himself to teach his catechism? Shall a Minister of the Church of England undertake the task? Shall a Methodist Preacher offer his services? Or shall a Presbyterian Minister be preferred? All these various religious denominations have their conscientious convictions which cannot be trifled with: they have their creed which must be respected. What shall we do? Let us all adopt the scheme which I have proposed for Public Libraries. Let every religious denomination have its own school. (f) Let religious instruction along with secular knowledge be daily given to the anxious youth. Let the Government extend to all denominations its parental patronage, and bestow on all an allowance proportionate to the daily attendance. Then, and then only shall peace and harmony reign again in our community; then only, shall we have a moral youth, a promising generation. I hope Dr. Ryerson will now understand why I object to his Common School System.

Quotes the "gentlemanly" style of the Leader.

7. In spite of the most convincing evidence, Dr. Ryerson seems to be determined never to retrace a wrong step once taken, or retract an untruth however palpable. I presume his Reverence acts up to the doctrine ascribed by him to *The Leader*, but put in practice by himself. "A lie once told should be stuck to."

Won't believe about Bishops Power and McDonell.

Without a blush I fear, he repeats again that Bishops Power and McDonell did not entertain the same views on the subject of the Separate *versus* the Common Schools. I laid before him a letter from the Honorable John Elmsley of Toronto, in which that gentleman stated most distinctly that His Lordship Bishop Power did "him the honor to confide to his charge a large share in the working of the Catholic Separate Schools, and that he was an energetic advocate and supporter of Catholic Separate Schools, and most resolutely opposed to mixed." To this what does Dr. Ryerson answer? Not one word. Of course it is easier to attest than to prove, more convenient to abuse than to refute a man. I am mistaken; excuse me, reader. Behold Dr. Ryerson's answer. "After his decease, Bishop Power was eulogized by me, (Dr. Ryerson) in a public and published address." A conclusive logic this, very much so.

Mr. Bruyere does not like some Catholics.

8. The Chief Superintendent of Education had asserted in his first communication that the Roman Catholic children who have been taught in the mixed schools, are as good Roman Catholics, as those who had been, or are taught in the Separate Schools. Against his assertion I protested most emphatically, and informed him at once, that we could easily afford to give them up to him, since they are, as a general rule, as Catholic and as Protestant as himself. Whereupon, taking me up to my word, the good Doctor exclaims in an ecstasy of joy: "I will cheerfully accept the charge, and treat this large class of my fellow-citizens with the same consideration and solicitude that I have always shown for their

(f) Interesting Problem "for Mr. B.:"—A certain district of country, say three miles square, has forty children, representing four or five denominations; *Query*—Should there be four or five schools or one; and four or five teachers, at £60 a-year each, equal to £240 or £300 a-year; or one at £80 or £100?

welfare as well as for their rights." I repeat again to Dr. Ryerson : he is welcome to them, he may hug them to his bosom till doomsday. But I cannot allow the following bold assertion connected with the same subject to pass unnoticed. "Now," says his Reverence, as the Separate Schools are only recent and few and far between in Upper Canada, and it follows that nineteen-twentieths, if not ninety-hundredths, of the Roman Catholics who have received any education in Upper Canada, have received it in the mixed schools."

Mr. Bruyere appeals to his Satanic Majesty—Separate Schools have always existed.

Allow me to say, dear Doctor, with all due respect to your character, his satanic majesty would blush at such palpable falsehood. If the Separate Schools *in their present form* are only recent, they have always existed *de facto*, whenever a Catholic settlement warranted the establishment of one. The Separate Schools in those days were only few and far between in Upper Canada, because Catholics themselves were few and far between. Does not Dr. Ryerson himself know that in the very days of Bishop McDonell whom he represents as being in favor of Common School Education, this saintly Prelate went all the way to England purposely to get Catholic Teachers, and brought over four of them, and placed them where there was sufficient population to require their services? Does he not know that St. Raphael, in Glengary, Alexandria also in Glengary, St. Andrew in the County of Stormont, and Perth in the County of Lanark, had Catholic teachers, Catholic Separate Schools *de facto*, long before the present Separate School Act was thought of! (g) Is he not aware that a Catholic College for the higher branches of education, was established at St. Raphaels, by the same venerable bishop, Dr. McDonell, so favorable to common education, if we are to give credit to the Chief Superintendent of Common Schools in Upper Canada? Nineteen-hundredths of the Roman Catholics, says Ryerson, who have received any education in Upper Canada, have received it in the mixed schools.

"An angel would shed tears."

An angel would shed tears at such a shameful perversion of truth, and utter absence of candor. Let me, in turn, ask Dr. Ryerson, how long is it since the present Common School System has existed. How could Catholics be educated in schools which had no existence at the time? (h) There were indeed, in those early days, Public Schools to which the youth of the vicinity resorted; but infidel Ryerson schools they were not. When will the light of common sense shine upon the Doctor's obtuse mind and give him to understand that I am speaking of his own common school system, his own godless and infidel schools, where Christianity is practically ignored; in a word, his State Schools, but a few years since imported into our midst from Yankee land, the land of Know-Nothingism? I hope, if the Doctor is not too far advanced in years, he will set himself to work and study the history of his own native land, and dwell particularly on dates and facts connected with education. I feel great delicacy, myself an infusion of a new foreign element, in being obliged to teach

(g) If so, why establish new ones? But then, these refer to only four municipalities. Where were the Separate Schools of the *four hundred* others, in which some (at least) of the Falstaff company, and all the "half heathens" (about 200,000 in Upper Canada), have been educated?

(h) What other schools were in existence? If the schools were "Catholic" in the early days, who has changed them since? The majority of the localities named still continue Catholic, notwithstanding their "half-heathenish" propensities.

Canadian History to the great native of Canada, Dr. Ryerson, Chief Superintendent of Education.

Won't refer to his former opinions on the duties of the parent and the State.

9 With the theory of Dr. Ryerson, viz : that to the State and not to the parent the child belongs, I have nothing to add ; (i) nor, I believe, any sensible man in Canada. The question having long been settled by the greatest geniuses, the most profound philosophers and statesmen of Europe, particularly of France, it ill becomes a village doctor, but yesterday a shouting methodist preacher, to set up his theory in opposition to the wisdom and learning of the rest of the world. I will merely remind him again that we are living in a christian country not among the pagan Spartans from whom he has borrowed his senseless scheme fit only for the inhabitants of the moon. We poor benighted Catholics have been taught that on parents devolves the duty of educating, as well as feeding, and clothing the child. The State will have sufficiently done its part, by enabling the parent to procure for his child such an education as he deems proper. (j)

Is sensitive about the "Foreign Element."

Before I conclude this already too long letter, I beg to submit to the public whether the course pursued by Dr. Ryerson towards Bishop De Charbonnell, now absent from this country, and myself personally, is calculated to give him much credit. I have raised my voice in the name of the whole Catholic body to protest against the injustice perpetrated by the Chief Superintendent of Education in demanding the application of the Clergy Reserves Funds, solely for the use of his own schools and Libraries, from which a large portion of this community can derive no advantage at all. Instead of answering me in a fair and impartial discussion, or what would have been more prudent for him, instead of remaining silent, he chooses to brand me with the opprobrious appellation ten times repeated, of *an infusion of a new foreign element*. Had Dr. Ryerson kept silence, we would have proceeded with our own Separate schools, hampered as they are with odious restrictions and illiberal provisions.

And the "conscientious convictions" created thereby.

When I remonstrate against his reverence, at the time that he is attempting to destroy them by giving to his Schools an overwhelming superiority over our own Separate Schools, I am met with a long discussion on the right of the State to educate the child, followed with the usual amount of ribaldry about *conscientious convictions manufactured to order*. When I give my reasons why we cannot allow our children to go to Dr. Ryerson's Schools, I am treated to a lecture on the "lethargy and enslavement of the human mind during the 'DARK AGES.'" When I prove to him that almost every book in his libraries contains doctrines or facts hostile to Catholics who, consequently cannot derive any benefit from them, the Chief Superintendent of Education accuses me of *aiming at controlling or destroying every man and every institution in the land*.

The "Foreign Element" expatiates on the high-handed robbery.

When I expatiate in the name of 1,150,000 Catholics on the injustice of

(i) Gives it up, then! Could not meet his own arguments. And then the *Leader*, too.—Strange! he could not find a "gentlemanly" heading for it!

(j) That's the doctrine:—"Parents alone must select their schools." But, then, what is to be done with the new idea of a "mortal sin?"

laying his rapacious hand on the Clergy Reserve Fund, and thus depriving them of their just share of the common property, I am abruptly told by his Reverence ; hush ! you are a foreigner. I appeal to a just and impartial public are Catholics bound to suffer themselves to be robbed by Dr. Ryerson, without the power of uttering a word of complaint, or expressing their grievance ? Is it just ; is it fair to place into the hands of a Methodist preacher the immense resources wrested from the Church of England by an act of the Provincial Parliament ?

Mr. Bruyere thinks Lower Canadians are a "new Foreign Element !"

Will the French Canadians, also a *new foreign element in this country*, thank Dr. Ryerson for the opprobrious epithets so recklessly flung in their face ? Will they sympathize with him when he pours his vial of ridicule upon their Chief Pastors and Priests ?—What will the Government say when they see their official and servant, extend the right hand of friendship to the Organ of the Clear Grits, the perpetual reviler of the present Administration ? On the other hand, what estimate must the Clear Grits form of the Chief Superintendent, a man to-day a Tory, to-morrow a Reformer, but ever ready to sell himself to whomsoever is willing to pay him well ?

Concludes by disclaiming Sensitiveness.

In conclusion I will say : were I as sensitive as my antagonist, I might complain of the unfair treatment I meet with at the hands of a certain portion of the press, which comments upon my letters without publishing them, or publishes Dr. Ryerson's personal diatribes, without allowing the public to see the other side of the question.

Hoping that the public will bear with me, and judge between the perpetual assailant of Catholics and myself, I submit the above rejoinder to their sense of justice and fair play, subscribing myself,

Their most obedient servant,

J. M. BRUYERE.

Toronto, 27th January, 1857.

No. 17. Dr. Ryerson's Remarks in Reply to the Rev. J. M. Bruyere.

From the obligations of duty, I have read the Rev. J. M. Bruyere's third letter, of upwards of four closely printed columns in this day's *Leader* ; but from the same obligations, I shall occupy only four short paragraphs in reply.

Mr. Bruyere's circling apostrophes.

1. In support of the four principal issues which Mr. Bruyere had raised in his first letter against the school system and its administration, he adduces not a single fact or authority, or clause of law, but repeats assertions, multiplies epithets, and rhapsodies to the extent of columns. He reasons, or rather apostrophizes, throughout in a circle—the characteristic style of his school on all theological and other questions : and the sum of his argument is, that Mr. Bruyere in many forms of speech, asserts to be true in January, what Mr. Bruyere had, in as many forms asserted to be true in December. This is all the strength of the charges

and argumentation of the new foreign ecclesiastical element against our schools and school system.

Mr Bruyere's miscellaneous Remarks.

2. The text-books of the Common Schools to which Mr. Bruyere says he objects, have been prepared by the National Board of Education in Ireland, and sanctioned alike by the Roman Catholic and Protestant authorities, and members of that board. So that Mr. Bruyere speaks without—and even against—authority from his own church, as well as against truth and reason. The Common Schools as they existed in the days of Bishops McDonell and Power, were less strict in regard to the character, morals, and qualifications of teachers, and non-sectarian text-books, and the discipline and conduct of pupils, than they are at the present time. The passages which Mr. Bruyere has been able to cull from two books in the Library Depository relating to occurrences in the Roman Catholic Church in past ages, are little in comparison of what may be found in the Roman Catholic Histories, from the same Depository, in regard to the Fathers of the Protestant Reformation, Protestantism generally, and every class of Protestants. Mr. Bruyere's renewed assertions in regard to Bishop Power, are not of the slightest weight when placed beside the facts of Bishop Power's position and proceedings in regard to our school system while he lived.

Mr. Bruyere's unfortunate opinions.

3. On the theory of the Duties of the State, or of society at large to each of its members—especially of its helpless and unprotected members—I have but given expression to what will be found in every standard writer on political economy or civil government on the Continent of Europe, as well as Great Britain and America.

The sum of his Efforts.

4. In conclusion, I have only noticed Mr. Bruyere because of the position he occupies; and when one thinks that empty assertions, despotic assumptions, and vulgar personalities that hiss through the many columns of his productions, constitute the whole strength in argument of the only organized ecclesiastical opposition (formed by this new foreign element in a section of one religious persuasion) against our school system, we may be well satisfied of its soundness and integrity; and with increased confidence and energy, may the public pursue its onward course in building up, maturing and extending a system which has been devised and established under the auspices of all parties in successive Administrations and Parliaments, and sustained by the people at large with unparalleled liberality, unanimity and patriotism.

E. RYERSON.

30th January, 1857.

No. 18.—Rev. J. M. Bruyere's Valedictory Address to Dr. Ryerson.

To the Conductors of the Press in Canada.

I was absent from home for a short time. On my return, Dr. Ryerson's remarks in reply to my third letter, were placed into my hands. As I read

them, methought I heard the dying fire of a retreating enemy. The good Doctor's powder is evidently exhausted. He has left the field of battle and decamped to parts unknown.

Mr. Bruyere is satisfied that his work is well done.

1. The Chief Superintendent of Education is pleased to re-assert that "in support of the four principal issues, which I had raised in my first letter against the School System and its administration, I adduce not a single fact or authority, or clause of a law, but repeat assertions, &c. &c." In answer to this puerile assertion, I will merely say—if the love of truth and honesty has lost all power upon the callous heart of my reckless opponent, I can but express my surprise that self-respect, at least, and a regard for his high station, have not succeeded in making him more guarded and cautious in his works. I leave it to the public who have read my second rejoinder of the 30th ult., to judge whether I have merely asserted or proved the question at issue.

Why the Irish National School System is denounced.

2. In vindication of the objectionable character of the text books used in the Common Schools in Upper Canada, the Chief Superintendent of Education states, that they "have been prepared by the National Board of Education in Ireland, sanctioned alike by the Roman Catholic and Protestant authorities and members of that board." I am sorry to say, Dr. Ryerson is too frequently most unfortunate in the selection of his proofs. Were his Doctorship in the least conversant with what is going on in the Catholic world, he would have read lately a pastoral of His Grace, the most Rev. Dr. Cullen, Archbishop of Dublin, Primate of Ireland and Delegate of the Pope in that country, in which the whole scheme of Common National Schools is most emphatically denounced and warned against, as fraught with the most serious dangers to the faith and morals of Catholic youth. (k) Alluding to the Queen's Colleges established in Ireland for the teaching of the higher branches of education, his Grace says: "Censured by the Holy See, and repudiated by the Irish hierarchy, the Queen's Colleges will never take root, nor permanently flourish in this Catholic country. Founded on the principle of indifferentism to religion, and placing religious doctrines, true and false, on the same footing of equality, they will never gain the confidence of the people of Ireland, who believe that there is but one faith, as there is but one baptism and one God." (l)

How the policy of the Catholic Ecclesiastics has changed.

Passing to the examination of the books compiled for the special use of the Common National Schools, the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin adds:—"The new books were to contain no special doctrine of Catholicity, and not even to mention the name of Catholic. Indeed, this plan has been carried so accurately into effect, that a pupil might, perhaps, read all the historical treatises of the National Board, without learning that there ever existed

(k) And yet his predecessor, Archbishop Murray, devoted the last eighteen years of his life to the creation and building up of that very same system; and likewise obtained for it the sanction of the Pope, and the *unanimous* support of the Irish Catholic clergy and people. Bishop Charbonnel, too, in 1852, declared that the Irish Schools contained all that he asked for. If wrong now, what about infallibility?

(l) And yet a late Irish paper says,—"Like the National Schools, the Colleges are under the ban of Rome. The Legate disapproves of them. The intelligent and independent Roman Catholics of Cork and Galway have repudiated the interference of their clergy, in dictating to them as to the propriety of sending their children to the Queen's Colleges. The collection made for the Roman Catholic University in Cork and Galway may be counted in halpence; while the 'Godless Colleges' are warmly approved and sustained." The only other Queen's College is that of Belfast, where the Presbyterians predominate.

such a body as the Holy Catholic Church, or such an Institution as that of the Roman Pontificate, which has spread the blessings of true religion and civilisation over a great part of the globe. Nay, more, in these books, the history of our country and church is almost totally ignored, and it is to be observed that, whilst in the extracts prepared for the pupils, the praises of England and Scotland are held forth in the enthusiastic language of their writers, we find in them very little to excite affection for our own dear country. Indeed, all these books bear on them the mark of the Protestant Dignitary now enjoying the See of Dublin, who could not communicate to them any of the spirit and of the faith of Ireland. Publications so devoid of every thing dear to the heart of our people, should give way to works of a different character!" Next come His Grace's views on the nature and tendency of Common Education. On this subject, Archbishop Cullen says:—"Dangers may have arisen or not for the past, but the system, of its own nature, is liable to cause them, and in progress of time will cause them. The mixture of Protestant, Presbyterian, and Catholic teachers, cannot act beneficially on the mind of children, who are guided very much by the example of those who preside over them, and are too ready to embrace their opinions. The mixture of Catholic and Protestant pupils must exercise an evil influence on their religious persuasions and practices. From mixed education we can expect nothing but evil. We should not acquiesce in it or encourage it."—Doctor Ryerson, who has, at different times, taken upon himself to lecture His Lordship Bishop De Charbonnel, for reminding the Catholics of his Diocese of their duties and rights as citizens and Catholics, will be surprised when he reads the following passage in Dr. Cullen's Pastoral:—"The influence of the great Catholic population of Ireland should be exercised in asserting their rights, and even our electors should use their votes to return men to Parliament determined and able to support unmixed education for Catholic children, and freedom of Education from State control for all." In closing these quotations, I will add: on the vital subject of Catholic education, Catholics the world over, are one. Pastors and flock, all hold the same views, are animated by the same feelings. The above principles, as laid down by Archbishop Cullen, are but the expression of the whole Catholic Church, in England, Ireland, the United States, Canada, (*m*) in a word, over the whole face of the Globe. I again beg the public to judge whether I have *spoken without and even against authority from my own Church*, (*n*) *as well as against truth and reason*, as Dr. Ryerson is pleased to assert in his last reply.

Further on the Parent, the State and the Church.

3. On the theory of the right or duty of the State or of the parent, concerning the education of the child, I will not dwell any longer, (*o*) except in so far as Dr. Ryerson's assertion goes. His reverence does not hesitate to inform the public that "he has but given expression to what will be found in every standard writer on political economy or civil government

(*m*) Witness Ireland, where the National Schools and Queen's Colleges are warmly supported; the United States, where the Common Schools are guarded, alike by Catholics and Protestants, with a jealous watchfulness; and our own land of Canada, where the inspiration of the same foreign spirit has branded the independent Catholic laity as "half heathens;" but all without effect—proving that Catholics, in free countries, think and act for themselves, and against the efforts of ultramontane aliens.

(*n*) "The Common Schools of Ireland, justly praised in your answer."—"Suffer me to urge our Government to give us a system which will be acceptable to us—a system which will not render the Irish here less agreeable than in Ireland."—*Bishop Charbonnel* in 1852.

(*o*) An unhappy subject.

on the Continent of Europe, as well as Great Britain and America." I have repeatedly reminded the Chief Superintendent of Education, that his long gone-by theory, concerning the rights of the State over the child, was imported from pagan Lacedemæon, and, consequently, unfit for a Christian country. If, however, my learned antagonist persists in asserting that he knows of no other theory on the subject—that in all his reading of works on political economy or civil government he has never met with any other—I beg leave to say, with the deepest sorrow, Dr. Ryerson's acquaintance with standard works bearing on the subject of political economy, is very limited, and confined within a very narrow range of political science. This could hardly be expected from one who assumes the pretentious title of Doctor. If such be your misfortune, however, go to study again, good Doctor, and extend your reading beyond the school text-book. Open some of those masterly works which have been composed by the greatest geniuses of modern times, the most profound philosophers, and most consummate statesmen of the Continent of Europe. Allow me to introduce you to the works of Count de Bonald, Count le Maistre, Bolmes, an humble son of poor benighted Spain, and a host of other productions of our days, which will, I trust, contribute to enlarge the too limited sphere of your literary acquirements. Read but a few pages—you will soon be convinced that your darling theory, viz., that the child belongs to the State,—has long since been exploded and scattered to the wind. (p)

The benighted Catholics and Protestants contrasted.

4. In his concluding paragraph, Dr. Ryerson still repeats his inflated laudation of his Common School System, which he represents as *sustained by the people at large with unparalleled liberality, unanimity, and patriotism*. As an illustration of this wonderful *unanimity and patriotism*, the Chief Superintendent of Education should have stated that, in the City of Toronto, out of a Protestant population of 29,550 souls, the incredible number of 1,570 children is the average daily attendance in these Model Schools. He should have informed the public that, in this same city, in a Protestant population of 8,884 children of school age, 1,570 youths of all denominations (Catholics excepted) attend his Model Schools, at a yearly cost of the very moderate sum of £7,093, 12s. 10d. Contrast, now, dear reader, the condition of our poor benighted Catholics with that of their more favored fellow-Christians of the Protestant persuasion. In the same City of Toronto, out of a Catholic population of 12,210 souls, the average daily attendance in our Catholic Separate Schools was, last year, 1,286. The total receipts for the support of these Catholic Schools, during the same year, including City Taxes and Legislative grants, amounted to £545. To return to Dr. Ryerson's Common Schools: I will say, very popular indeed must be a system of education which can command such sympathy and exhibit such cheering results! As to the liberality with which the Common School System is supported, it cannot be denied. Let the reader recollect that, for the education of Dr. Ryerson's 1,570 pupils, the City of Toronto has to pay only £7,093 12s. 10d.; whilst Catholics, for the education of their 1,286 children, received, last year, including their City taxes and Legislative grants, £545. To these rather unpleasant facts

(p) And what about Mr. Bruyere's—that he belongs to the "church"?

I must not forget that my incomparable antagonist has an unanswerable reply, viz.: *This new foreign and ecclesiastical element against our Schools and School System.* Ah! doctor, allow me to say, for the future, spare my feelings. This is the thirty-fifth time, if I recollect well, that these ugly expressions are flung into my face. I can bear it no longer. I confess it now: I am a foreigner, you are a native; therefore you are in the right, I must be in the wrong. (q)

The *Leader's* approved style of approved Controversialist writing.

In justice to my distinguished antagonist, the Great Native of Canada, I must admit that his last communication to the public is the least objectionable, because the shortest. His reply occupies only four short paragraphs. Still, I must say, every paragraph, every line, every word of his parting address, contains a lamentable perversion of truth. When will this maddened enemy to Catholicity learn to tell the truth? Despairing of ever correcting a habit which, I fear, he must have contracted from his earliest youth, I send him to his good mother, if still alive. Perhaps maternal endearment will have more influence over his obdurate heart than arguments, facts, &c. &c.

The "very great kindness and courtesy" of the condescending *Leader*.

In conclusion, I beg to offer to the able and liberal Editor of the *Leader*, the sincere expression of my heartfelt gratitude, for the very great kindness and courtesy with which he has condescended to open his columns to my communications, such as they are. I hope my distinguished opponent will not refuse to join with me, in the discharge of this imperative duty towards our common friend. I would be wanting to myself, were I to forget the Editor of the *Globe*, whose delicate sense of editorial propriety has prompted him to comment on my letters, without publishing them. To all, friends and foes, in this discussion, I take pleasure in offering the expression of my best wishes for their prosperity, and beg to subscribe myself

Their most humble and obedient Servant,
Toronto, February 4th, 1857. J. M. BRUYERE.

No. 19.—Bishop Pinsoneault to the Rev. J. M. Bruyere.

LONDON, C. W., Feb. 10, 1857.

REV. AND DEAR SIR,—Pending your recent controversy with the Chief Superintendent of Education, for Canada West, which I have read with the greatest interest, I thought proper to refrain from intruding upon your valuable time, in order to congratulate you for your earnest and able advocacy of Catholic education. But now that it has come to an end, I hasten to offer you my warmest thanks and sympathies; and at the same time, I beg to avail myself of this opportunity to suggest the propriety of having the whole correspondence—as it has appeared in the *Leader*—got up in pamphlet form; (r) to which, if possible, might be added the very remarkable letters addressed by "A Protestant," to the Hon. Attorney General Macdonald, and lately published in the *Catholic Citizen*.

(q) Good! In Mr. B.'s last letter, however, "foreign element" was said to have been branded opprobriously, ten times!—"Unintentional slip."

(r) Here it is; together with the famous letters of Bishop Charbonnel, a greater authority than the "Protestant"—whose letters the Editor has not yet thought it worth while to read.

The Foreign Element.

The poor attempt of the Reverend Official, to represent you as the organ of but a contemptible *foreign party*—with which the body of Catholics in Canada, has no common sympathy—is altogether unfair and groundless; so much so, that I do not hesitate to say—and I say it advisedly—that you have undoubtedly expressed the views of the entire Hierarchy in Canada—nay, of the whole Catholic Church. Any one at all conversant with Catholic unity, is aware that—on the subject of Catholic Education, as well as on any other involving Catholic principles—pastors and flocks are always one. (s)

The Church forbids, and the People submit.

Has not the principle of the godless Common School system been repeatedly declared *dangerous to faith and morals*, by our own Provincial Councils, by the Councils of Ireland, more especially by the celebrated Council of Thurles—convened and presided over by the Right Rev. Dr. Cullen, delegate of the Holy See—and finally by the Sovereign Pontiff himself? Hence it is that the Catholic body, which believes in the unerring authority of the Church in all questions appertaining to faith and morals, never will, because conscience forbids it, approve and countenance this Common School system, as now imposed upon us in this section of the Province. (t) The least, therefore, that we can do, Rev. Dear Sir, is to offer you our well deserved thanks for the noble stand you have taken, and for your very able defence of Catholic education, and this despite your unusually arduous occupations during the protracted absence of your venerable ordinary:

“Foreign Element” not a dignified Expression.

And here, I sincerely regret to be under the painful necessity to express my utter disapprobation of the unbecoming language used by the Chief Superintendent of Education, when speaking of my most honored Brother in the Episcopacy. Such flippant expressions as these—*the Charbonnells and Bruyeres, a new foreign element*, and others,—repeatedly brought forward, as it were with a vengeance—imply a disregard of decorum which we certainly should not have expected from an official of the Government, much less from the Head of the *Education* Office.

“Nativism” (Catholic Expression) out of Place.

It is a painful duty for me to be compelled to administer such a rebuke to a gentleman, whom I would fain honor for his high station, and would gladly eulogise—if I could—for his impartiality. I cannot but be grateful to him for the courtesy he has shown me, when on a recent occasion—which he has alluded to in his first reply—I consulted him about the Separate School Bill; but his courtesy in *private* life must not prevent me from censuring his *official* misdemeanor. How a gentleman in his station—evidently well read—could have betrayed in the above Controversy such ignorance of Catholic matters, and such a gross disregard of Catholic feelings, I am really at a loss to understand. But be this as it may, you have said enough to teach him, that *in the Church*, there is no foreign element, and that—in virtue of the all powerful unity of

(s) Save when the “flocks” exhibit half-heathenish propensities.

(t) And which the Bishop does not support, because he has a Separate School of his own in London.

our Apostolic Faith—one spirit and one soul pervade the whole body, without distinction of native or foreign born. (u) Besides, nativism had nothing to do with the question at issue, and is rather a *foreign element* itself when brought repeatedly to bear—as a conclusive argument—against the liberty of conscience, which is involved in the present Common School System. It strikes me that in a colony where thousands of foreigners are yearly pouring upon our shores—to the great benefit of our young country—nativism is rather out of place, or at least too premature for the time being. At all events, the native flag should not have been hoisted by the Reverend Chief of Education, who is naturally expected to keep aloof from all political platforms.

Tries to excuse Bishops McDonell and Power.

Your adversary is not more fortunate, in his oft repeated attempts to throw on his side the whole moral weight of the late Bishops McDonell and Power. The most he could have said with any truth, was that they tolerated to a certain extent what they could not prevent; but to pretend that they were favourable to mixed education, is injurious to their honored memory, and untrue in point of fact. (v) Need I say that it is notorious that both these zealous prelates labored most faithfully and strenuously—in their own times—to establish thorough Catholic Schools whenever and wherever circumstances permitted them. The fact of Bishop Power being a member of the Board only shows his desire of giving a fair trial to a new system, concerning which many a time have I heard him express his misgivings, but the deplorable results of which his lamentable and premature death prevented him from witnessing and rebuking. As for his venerable successor he did what his conscience prompted him to do as soon as he felt that he could no longer countenance the wholesale sacrifice of Catholic interests and principles, which he is bound to uphold to the utmost of his power; and so would have done both the above-named Bishops, as well as any other.

Endorses Mr. Bruyere.

Concerning what you have said about Public Libraries, the question is not whether you were right or wrong with regard to the exact number of Catholic books said to be on their shelves, but whether you had good ground for denouncing them as dangerous to faith and morals. Now, most emphatically do I endorse your sound views on this question, for we can hardly be less opposed to mixed Libraries than to mixed education,—the same principles of faith and morals being equally involved in both systems. Witness the scandalous problem extracted by you from one of the standard books issued by the Department of Education. And God knows how many other passages no less objectionable might be brought to light by a careful perusal of the various books connected both with Public Libraries and Common Schools.

It behoves, therefore, the pastors of the Church to warn the flock committed to their care against seeking such noxious and poisonous pastures as are held out by these Public Libraries, so warmly patronized by our Reverend official.

(u) Strange, that one spirit and soul should require "mortalsins," and clerical dictation, as to votes, &c.!

(v) And yet Bishop Power acted as Chairman of the Board of Education and signed circulars in favor of the school system, recommending the education of native teachers, and the use of the Irish National Books in Canadian Schools.

Bishop shews dignified "style."

Again, great stress has been laid upon your so-called intolerance, (as if truth could tolerate error,) which would fain "enslave human reason in ignominious fetters." Bombastic words and high-sounding sentences were used by the Reverend gentleman of the Education office in order to illustrate—as he fancied very forcibly—this old and now stale calumny—has it not been repeated *usque ad nauseum*? But his puny efforts in this regard will only meet the fate of similar attempts previously made by more powerful and dangerous writers—the indignant scorn of every right-minded person at all conversant with the *true* history of the Church. As for you, my dear Sir, you can well afford not to grudge him his paltry gratification, in his discomfiture on the main question at issue. Please allow him to "raise the wind" in the conventicle to his heart's content. In the present instance this shabby attempt is a harmless *ruse*—for it has decidedly proved a dead failure.

Freedom of Education.

Now, the case is this—We ask no favor, but simple justice. If the enemies of freedom of education in Upper Canada, cannot afford to *yield* us—willingly and cheerfully—that justice which Catholics in Lower Canada have spontaneously *extended* long ago, (*w*) and are now extending, to their separated brethren, at least let them be strictly just and impartial. We ask no more. But it is meet they should know that whenever the sacred principles of faith and morals are at stake, we cannot, on any account, yield one *iota*.

Bishops must carry the Day.

Let obloquy, calumnies, abuses, revilings and threats be the consequence. We expect it—we are prepared for it—nay, it is our daily lot—"*discipulus non est supra Magistrum; in mundo pessuram habebitis*;"—hence, no despondency, no supineness, no relaxation in our protracted struggle, but a cool, unflinching determination, which will never yield before any obstacle how great soever. Many otherwise well disposed people, may perhaps be at a loss to understand our perseverance in this—for us—vital question, viz: to procure the entire freedom of Catholic education. What is a mystery to them, is a plain question with us; it is but consistency with our religious principles which are involved in that question. But when it comes to that point, there comes also the necessity of uttering the stubborn "*non possumus*" once boldly delivered by the Apostles in the face of human power, and ever since repeated in similar circumstances by their legitimate successors in the Ministry,—and such *we are*, the Reverend official notwithstanding. There lies the true secret of our so-called obstinacy. We have been forced by weakness and intolerance combined—into using that "*non possumus*;" it will uphold us, as it has ever upheld our fathers in the faith, under much more trying circumstances; and finally—sooner or later—it will undoubtedly ensure our complete success in this just and necessary struggle for the above sacred cause; for, succeed—we *must*, we *will*. (x)

(w) Query—Is not Lower Canada a colony of a Protestant Government? To whom, then, are privileges extended.

(x) That's what Bp. Charbonnel said in 1852, when *he* "tried to raise the wind" among the half-heathens.

Concurrence in Controversy.

In conclusion, Reverend dear Sir, I beg leave to express once more, my entire concurrence in the views and sentiments advocated by you, in this controversy, relative to your strictures on the present Common School system, and in your untiring efforts in struggling to procure the complete freedom of education to our Catholic community. Most cordially do I concur with you on this momentous subject, which Catholics have so much at heart; and, rest assured, that they never will give up the contest until justice is granted them.

I take great pleasure in thus acknowledging your efficient services in behalf of our poor children, and I think I can venture to say, that, not only have you the sympathies of the whole Catholic body of the Province (*y*)—with all the Bishops at its head—enlisted in your favor, but also those of a large and most respectable number of our separated brethren.

Begging your pardon for intruding so much on your valuable time. I remain,

With very great regard,

Your's affectionately in Christ,

+ ADOLPHE,

To the Rev. M. Bruyere,

St. Michael's Palace, Toronto.

Bishop of London.

Dr. Ryerson's Answer to Bishop Pinsoneault.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE LEADER.

SIR,—I have not until this evening had a moment to make a few remarks, which seem to be required from me, upon a letter published in the *Leader* of the 20th instant, addressed by the Right Reverend Adolphe Pinsoneault, Roman Catholic Bishop of London, to the Rev. J. M. Bruyere, endorsing the latter as the true and able expounder of the views of the Roman Catholic hierarchy respecting our school system, adopting the attacks of the latter upon myself, and adding two or three more on his own account.

What Mr. Bruyere asserted.

Mr. Bruyere, under pretext of objecting to the application by municipalities of their shares of the clergy reserve fund to procuring school apparatus and libraries, as suggested by me, attacked me in the most offensive terms, and charged me with having been guilty of the grossest partiality in the discharge of my duties, of having excluded all Roman Catholic civil and ecclesiastical histories from the catalogue of library books, while I inserted those of an opposite character; of having originated legal restrictions by which neither school apparatus or books could be procured for the Roman Catholic children of separate schools. The language of Mr. Bruyere was so abusive, his statements so extravagant, that I did not intend to notice them at all, until repeatedly pressed to do so, and privately assured that these statements and attacks were the manifesto of a party, and not the mere effusions of an individual. To his voluminous abuse I made no reply; but I showed there were no such legal restrictions as had been alleged—that separate schools had been supplied by me from the

(*y*) That is, the select "few" as opposed to that vast majority of Canadian Catholics, who are styled "half heathens," by the "foreign element."

school apparatus and library depositories of the Educational Department upon the same terms as other schools—that the precise books which had been named as having been excluded, were all in the catalogue prepared by me, and that even Roman Catholic prayers and religious instruction were used in some of the schools (and that by my official interpretation of the general regulations) from which Mr. Bruyere had represented me as having excluded all recognition of Christianity. *a*)

Endorsed by Bishop Pinsoneault.

Bishop Pinsoneault now formally endorses these statements and attacks; thanks Mr. Bruyere heartily for having made them, and of course considers it an "official misdemeanor" in me to defend the school system and myself against them. As if the selected agent of Bishop Pinsoneault and his colleagues had the prescriptive right to heap epithets and imputations upon me, scarcely decent in the ordinary walks of life, irrespective of what he himself terms my "high station;" and as if Bishop Pinsoneault's endorsement could make that true which was before untrue—that right which was before wrong.

Fallacy of the Bishop's Arguments.

In proceeding from general endorsement to special reasoning, the Bishop says:—"Concerning what you have said about public libraries, the question is not whether you were right or wrong with regard to the exact number of Catholic books said to be on the shelves, but whether you had good ground for denouncing them as dangerous to faith and morals." (*b*) By this fallacy of unstating the question, the Bishop absolves Mr. Bruyere for having stated what was untrue, in charging me with having excluded from the libraries certain books which he named, and which were actually contained in the official catalogue. There was no question as to the "exact number of Catholic books"—this is Bishop Pinsoneault's own invention—but as to whether certain books specified by Mr. Bruyere had been excluded by me from the catalogue as he had asserted. The "efforts" of the Bishop to evade these facts by unstating the question, will therefore be regarded as hardly less "puny" than those of Mr. Bruyere in first stating them in support of his charges against me.

Bishop's efforts against the Character of Bishops Power and McDonell.

Nor do the "puny efforts" of the Bishop (if I may quote his own words in reference to myself) appear more gigantic, although certainly more bold, in asserting that the late Bishops McDonell and Power were opposed to mixed education. "The most he could have said with truth (says the Bishop) was that they tolerated to a certain extent what they could not prevent; but to pretend that they were favorable to mixed education is injurious to their honored memory and untrue in point of fact. Need I

(*a*) Mr. Bruyere wrote to Dr. Ryerson on the 23rd October, enclosing a letter which stated that in one of the Common Schools "Catholic prayers were used morning, noon and evening, and that the Catholic Catechism was taught during school hours." Dr. Ryerson replied that "the Trustees, Teachers and parents could exercise their own discretion as to the prayers and books of religious instruction, so as not to compel Protestant children to be present against their parents' wishes, nor to lessen the amount of secular instruction to which they were entitled in the school." A fortnight after receiving this reply, Mr. Bruyere denounced the schools in which the Trustees and Teacher could so act, as "houses of education from which religion is banished, and where the poison of infidelity or heresy is mixed with the pure draughts of human knowledge!"

(*b*) Beautiful salvo for Mr. B.'s conscience. According to the above, Mr. B. may assert as many falsities as he pleases in regard to *matters of fact*: it will be of no consequence if he can bring in anything else. The above shews also how completely Mr. B. was foiled.

say it is notorious that both these zealous prelates labored most faithfully and strenuously—in their own times—to establish thorough catholic schools whenever and wherever circumstances permitted them.” (c) In reply to this statement, I remark—1. That there is not a vestige of proof to sustain it, in any circular, or letter, or writing put forth by either of the excellent prelates mentioned. 2. That although the provisions of the law for separate schools have existed since the commencement of the present system in 1840, and although Bishop McDonell resided in Kingston, and Bishop Power in Toronto, but two Separate Roman Catholic Schools were established under the law in either Kingston or Toronto until after the death of these prelates. 3. That Bishop Power not only acted with the Board of Education (a mixed Board) and presided at its meetings until the week before his death, but his name stands first of the six members who individually signed the first circular to the Municipalities of Upper Canada on the establishment of the Normal School,—a mixed school—as the great instrument of giving effect to one system of Common Schools. Would Bishop Pinsonneault affix his name to such a circular? No, far from it—he denounces what Bishop Power commended, and condemns the school books which Bishop Power had joined in sanctioning. The late Bishop McDonell died before I had any connection with our school system; but I knew the sentiments of Bishop Power from frequent intercourse and consultation with him on school matters; and I know that he, and even Bishop Charbonnel, on his first coming to Toronto, professed not to desire separate schools beyond what they termed “protection from insult,”—that is, in such cases only where Roman Catholic children could not attend the Common Schools without being insulted and imposed upon on account of their religion. The necessity of a separate school they lamented as a misfortune, instead of advocating it as a principle. (d) In this feeling I entirely sympathised. I thought the Roman Catholics had been hardly treated in Ireland. The political and religious feeling was very strong at the time between Roman Catholics and Orangemen in Upper Canada, and often developed itself in acts of violence on occasions of public assemblage; I was resolved to act towards the Roman Catholics as I would towards the members of any other religious persuasion—to do all in my power to protect them, and to aid in their intellectual and social elevation, without any interference with their religious views and feelings. I have done so to this day, and shall continue to do so, notwithstanding the attacks and abuse (not to say ingratitude) of certain of their ecclesiastics who have lately come to Upper Canada, who practically know nothing of the circumstances of former times, or of the local institutions, social relations and wants of the people; and for whose conduct their poor people are not responsible. (e)

Bishop Pinsonneault is sensitive on “Nativeism.”

And this leads me to remark on another point respecting which both Bishop Pinsonneault and his *protège* evince much sensitiveness. It is what they oddly enough call my “*nativism*,” which the Bishop says “is out of

(c) Then *how is it* that there was no “agitation,” no “mortal sins,” and no threats of “excommunication,” or directions as to “votes” during their lifetime; and, in fact, not until after the “foreign element” commenced its crusade in 1851–2? Bishop Pinsonneault and his *protège* can reply, perhaps.

(d) Yes, and let Bishop Charbonnel and his subordinates deny it if they can; or say that they have not since changed their tone, and now demand them as a “right”—not as a “protection,” or a “misfortune.”

(e) And with which they are in no way satisfied,—as we well know.

place or at least too premature for the time being. At all events the native flag should not have been hoisted by the Reverend Chief of Education, who is naturally expected to keep aloof from political platforms." This is the first intimation I have heard of my having anything to do with "political platforms," for declining all recognitions of which I have offended much and suffered much, in former years; nor was I before aware that there was any such political platform as "nativeism" in Upper Canada, or a single journal or political man that advocated it. I know that some of my most earnest essays of past years were directed against the indulgence of any feeling or prejudice on account of national origin, or birth place, or education;—that the duty of all classes was to forget these accidental distinctions, and unite in one noble, patriotic feeling of *Canadianism*,—regarding Canada as their country, their *home*—the home and hope of their children,—and its highest advancement their highest earthly interest and glory. (f) What I mean in referring to the introduction of a "new foreign element" into Canada, is the direct antagonist of this true Canadian feeling—not emigration from abroad—but foreign inspirations, feelings and views, at variance with what have heretofore existed in Upper Canada—antagonistic to Canadian independence, and to the growth of Canadian intellect, liberty and prosperity.

How the foreign Bishops erect voting platforms of "mortal sins."

I leave it with Bishops Charbonnel and Pinsoneault to erect a "political platform," according to which—under pain of the highest clerical penalties,—every vote shall be given, whether for a constable or a Legislative Councillor—whether in a school section or in the Legislature. My "platform" is—the hearts of Canadian people for Canada,—the rights of Canadians without distinction against compulsory taxation for sectarian purposes,—the rights of Canadians without exception to education and knowledge,—the rights of Canadians without restriction to tax themselves to make their children intelligent men and women,—the rights of Canadians without preference to the protection and enjoyment of their own religious teaching.

True "freedom of education," and its reverse.

• This is what I call "freedom of education," in the true and legitimate sense of the word. But it is a very different kind of "freedom of education" from that which Bishop Pinsoneault claims, which is not the freedom now enjoyed by the Roman Catholics to a greater extent than any other religious persuasion in Upper Canada and to a greater extent than that enjoyed by the Protestants in Lower Canada, as I have more than once shown; but a freedom of one persuasion to demand and receive, for its own sectarian purposes, funds of the State without any responsibility to the State, or even inspection by it (g)—a freedom to make the municipalities taxgatherers for a sect—a freedom which deprives muni-

(f) "When a man emigrates to Canada, his hopes are no longer English, or Irish, or Scotch, or French, or German, but *Canadian*..... It was the first duty and true interest of the earliest settlers in Canada to make the most of their adopted country—to look at home as much as possible, and to look abroad as little as possible—to rely upon themselves for the management of their country, as well as for the management of their farms and shops, and not upon foreign management in the one case any more than in the other."—*Dr. Ryerson in the Journal of Education*, 1850.

(g) As Bishop Charbonnel demanded in 1855 "to place Roman Catholic Separate Schools, for everything, exclusively under only one Official, not opposed to separate schools, and to give them an equal share of ALL school funds"—"nothing short of which will satisfy the conscientious convictions (!) of the [few ultra-montane] Catholics of this Province!"

cialties, or rather the people in each municipality, of the power of taxing themselves for the education of their children, without collecting and paying over a corresponding sum into the coffers of a sect,—a freedom which relieves a sect from the responsibility and trouble of levying school rates, yet invests it with absolute power of receiving rates levied by others,—a freedom which gives to one sect, or rather the heads of one sect, greater power over parents, over municipalities, and over the taxable property of the country, than that which is possessed by the Executive Government itself,—the “freedom of education” more appropriately deserving to be called “despotism in education,”—despotism over the child, over the parent, over taxable property, over municipalities, and over State Funds.

What the Foreign Element seek to influence.

As to whether I have been justified in ascribing to a “foreign element” this new doctrinal exposition of “freedom of education” which extends to all the politics, elections, and government of the country, may be judged from the facts, that it was first proclaimed by a Prelate who had drawn all his inspirations and sympathies from the Continent of Europe, and has been most stoutly advocated by one of kindred inspirations and sympathies,—that the present Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Paul Cullen—who had spent twenty years on the Continent before his appointment, denounces the school books and schools that his predecessor the late venerable Dr. Murray had devoted eighteen years of zealous labour as a member of the National Board of Education, to prepare and introduce into Ireland. (*h*) Indeed, if I am correctly informed, Bishop Pinsoneault himself, in his first Inaugural Discourse, avowed his supreme allegiance to the Sovereign of Rome, and none but a secondary or subordinate allegiance to any other Sovereign. For myself I hesitate not to avow that my first earthly allegiance is to the people and institutions of Canada, and to the Queen as our lawful sovereign and parental protector; and I doubt not such is and will ever be the allegiance of the Representatives of the Canadian people, whether in the Municipalities or in the Legislature.

How the Catholics Support the Schools.

But the Bishop claims the united Catholic body are of his views as to “godless Common School system being dangerous to faith and morals.” His argument to prove this statement is not an appeal to facts as they exist—that more than nine-tenths of the Roman Catholic children are still sent by their parents to the Common Schools, notwithstanding all the mandates and menaces put forth to alienate them, and that scarcely a week passes without my receiving letters from Catholic trustees and parents who have been urged into establishing and sending to separate schools, as to how they may regain their right to return to the Common Schools. There are upwards of three hundred and fifty townships in Upper Canada in which there is not a single separate school, although the Roman Catholics are numerous in many of them; but they are living in friendship with their Protestant neighbors and all are educating their children together. (*i*) But

(*h*) *Query* for the Bishops and their *protège*: Would Archbishop Murray have consented to such a proceeding had he been alive? Or would they have dared to threaten *him* with “mortal sins,” and “excommunication,” because he chose to support the National System? And if they dare not do so to him, why are the terrors of the Church manufactured for his countrymen—in both Ireland and Canada—by a new foreign ecclesiastical element?

(*i*) The Bishop cannot account for it; save that he knows the Catholic laity claim and exercise the right of individual choice in the matter.

instead of appealing to these facts, the Bishop appeals to the Provincial Clerical Councils of Baltimore and Quebec, and to the Council of Thurles in Ireland, which have declared against the principle of our Common Schools, and this declaration has been approved by Dr. Cullen, delegate of the Holy See, and, at length, by the Sovereign Pontiff. "Hence it is (says the Bishop) that the Catholic body which believe in the *unerring authority* of the Church in all questions appertaining to *faith* and *morals*, never will, because conscience forbids it, approve and countenance this Common School system, as now imposed on us in this section of the Province." Here is the origin—the recent origin of the warfare against our Common School system. And is it not wholly a *foreign element*? Here it may also be seen how "conscientious convictions" can be manufactured to order. Dr. Paul Cullen, after twenty years inhaling of foreign sympathies, comes to Ireland and proclaims a crusade against the National System of Education which his predecessor had aided to establish and build up for eighteen years; then a Bishop from the continent comes to Toronto and commences a war against a National School System which his predecessor had aided to establish and build up during several years; and this we are told is now a question of *morals*, binding upon the conscientious convictions of every good catholic, and from which he is not to depart under the highest penalties, whether he be a peasant in a remote township voting at an election, or Minister of the Crown voting in the Legislature! And this we are told is the essence of "Catholic Unity"—one man in Europe thinking, and commanding what shall and shall not be thought, said or done by electors and statesmen in Upper Canada. This is a new illustration of the famous doctrine of Louis the Fourteenth, "*L'état c'est moi*." The Canadian state is to be one man, and that one man residing in Europe! I rather agree with the sentiment of Hæmon, in the tragedy of Antigone, "There is no state where one man's will is law." If one man alone has the right to think and command what shall be believed and done by a whole people, there can be no civil liberty, no mental freedom, and therefore no mental development, no social advancement, no national civilization.

Bishop on private courtesy in official acts.

It remains for me to notice Bishop Pinsoneault's singular distinction between my private and official conduct. He says: "I cannot but be grateful to him (Chief Superintendent) for the courtesy he has shown me, when, on a recent occasion, I consulted him about the Separate School Bill; but his courtesy in *private* life must not prevent me from censuring his *official* misdemeanor." It appears, then, that my replying in a newspaper to attacks made upon me by Bishop Pinsoneault's *protège*, is not only an official act, but an "official misdemeanor," while my receiving him in my office when he calls to confer with me officially is an *unofficial* act, and is nothing more than "courtesy in *private* life!" So unnatural and absurd a distinction ought not to be made by a Bishop and especially one who claims to be the author and expounder of "unerring authority." Most persons would make the very opposite distinction, and say that my replying to either Bishop Pinsoneault, or Mr. Bruyere, was no part of my official duty—while holding verbal or written consultations in my office with persons applying to me in my official capacity was strictly official. But Bishop Pinsoneault omits to say that he also called upon me to procure School

Maps, &c., for Separate Schools, which were furnished to him upon the same terms as to the authorities of Public Schools,—in contradiction to the statement of Mr. Bruyere, who has said that Roman Catholic children in Separate Schools were denied School Maps and apparatus. Bishop Pinsoneault procures Maps from me for his Separate Schools, with the grant of one hundred per cent. upon the sum paid by him, and then thanks Mr. Bruyere for asserting that Separate Schools were excluded from such an advantage, and that by regulations prepared by me! (j)

A Challenge.

As Bishop Pinsoneault has entered the arena in aid of Mr. Bruyere, I have no objection to meet him in his own chosen field of public discussion; but I may suggest to him a more tangible and satisfactory mode of testing the truth of his charges against my acts and the provisions of the School Laws:—a Select Committee of the Legislative Assembly. In two Annual Reports I have suggested an inquiry into the whole School System, before further legislation on Separate Schools. I am prepared to meet Bishop Pinsoneault before such a Committee and answer for any act of my administration he may think proper to arraign, and to vindicate the equity and fairness of the School Law against any charges he may prefer, and show that the very clauses and provisions of the Separate School Act specially complained of, are precisely as they were introduced into the Legislative Council by the Hon. Colonel Taché, in Quebec, two years since, and at the request of those who now complain of them; and, furthermore, that I have interpreted and administered them in the most liberal spirit, even beyond what is required by the letter of the law. (k)

Make specific charges against the law.

I would also submit to Bishop Pinsoneault, whether it would not be more dignified, more just between man and man, more respectful and considerate to the public, for him and his subordinates, when they write against the school law, if, instead of attacking me, they would quote (not misrepresent) the provisions of the Act to which they object, and state the ground on which they demand their repeal or modification. There would thus be avoidance of personal collision, and a calm intelligent discussion of public measures. And I may add, that as in my last Annual Report, I have stated and vindicated the principles on which our Common School system is founded, and the liberality of the provisions in regard to Separate Schools, whether it would be more becoming and practical for Bishop Pinsoneault to reply to my Report, than to utter and endorse unjust charges against myself and unfounded representations against the School System.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

E. RYERSON.

Tuesday Evening, 24th February, 1857.

(j) A mode of argument pretty generally followed by him and his *protégé*, in other portions of this correspondence.

(k) They were not satisfied with the law as Dr. Ryerson had proposed it, and as it originally stood; but by a scandalous proceeding induced the Government to pass an Act affecting Upper Canadian interests by Lower Canada votes—after the Upper Canadian members had left for their homes, and within two days of the close of the session at Quebec. in 1855. They framed a law, but did not know how it would work, and the very provisions they now denounce, are the very provisions they themselves prepared; and which passed both houses without amendment,—just as they were introduced!

Addendum in regard to Bishop Power.

The charge has been reiterated time and again that Bishop Power was opposed to the National School system of Upper Canada, but this has been ably and finally met by Dr. Ryerson in his reply to Bishop Pinsoneault. In addition to that reply it may be added : 1. That during Bishop Power's lifetime, the Irish School system—of which ours is to a great extent a copy—was warmly and unanimously supported by the Catholic clergy, and was sanctioned by the Pope ; but that now foreign views have been introduced into Ireland, and Archbishop Murray's successor is endeavoring to pull down the noble work so patriotically erected and so ably supported by his venerable predecessor. The same views introduced into Canada, are seeking to accomplish the same objects here, although formerly the Canadian ecclesiastic who now wars against our schools, spoke of the "justly praised National Schools of Ireland," and demanded that the "condition of the Irish here might not be less agreeable than it was in Ireland." 2. That Bishop Power, whose birth and sympathies made him a thorough Canadian, while Chairman of the Provincial Board of Education expressed his "*approbation of the admirable series of elementary school books published by the Irish National Board, and felt great satisfaction in recommending them for general use in the Common Schools of Upper Canada ;*" and further recommended the Municipal Councils to provide for the training at the Normal School, of one or more youths of their municipality, so as "to supply the Model and principal schools of the Province *with the best class of native teachers,*"—concluding the circular with the following words :

"We venture to hope that this subject will receive the favorable consideration of the several District Councils ; and to their early as well as patriotic and benevolent attention we earnestly recommend it. *It is the purpose of the Board to educate young men for Canada, as well as in it, and that the whole system of domestic economy, discipline and instruction at the Provincial Normal School shall have reference to the future circumstances and employment of the scholars.*

(Signed)

"MICHAEL, BISHOP OF TORONTO†,
"Chairman."

No more emphatic contradiction could be given to the assertions of those who seek to make Bishop Power an antagonist to our National Schools ;—while it may safely be affirmed that the sentiments above expressed are, and will continue to be, the sentiments of the large majority of the intelligent and liberal-minded Catholics of Upper Canada.



